

Other cares and delights will occupy you then. Your favourite perch—the post of the cell bedstead—after the day's routine of romp and recreation is over, will know you no more. In its place you will have the waving bough and leafy shade of some tall sycamore, from whence you will serenade your more congenial mate, and view the beauties of some smiling landscape. Happy in your natural sphere, you will join in the general concert of Nature in vocal praise of the bounteous Author of the bright and joyous external world.

Pending this hour of separation, you shall be both chairman and audience of a course of lectures. Our evenings will suffice for this work; and, as an inducement to obtain from you an attentive and patient hearing, I promise most faithfully that you shall be restored to liberty the day after the delivery of the last lecture of the series.

Not knowing what impressions you may have formed of the strange beings whom you see moving about the prison grounds every day, I shall devote our first lectures to the task of enlightening you upon the matter—their crimes, and how they perform them; their schemes and dodges; their opinions on men and things deemed to be moral; their general habits and characteristics; exploits in criminal pursuits; slang and literature; their religion, &c. I shall next speak of the causes which act as recruiting agencies for so many huge criminal institutions like that in which we now are, and conclude by pointing out such remedies for the diminution of ignorance, poverty, pauperism, and crime as seem to me to be both just and feasible, and which, if only carried out in time by wise statesmanship, would minimise that social injustice which begets the sense of wrong and discontent in the minds of the labouring masses, and the consequent desire for revolutionary change that are now disturbing society, and preparing the way for a great social upheaval in nearly every civilised country.

In dealing with the various types of criminal represented in

this prison, I will follow the prison rule and classify them by their conduct instead of by their crimes or sentences, and I will then analyse each class and describe the various criminal pursuits represented therein. It is only by a knowledge of their acts and schemes of crime when at war with society, and by an insight into their behaviour when under disciplinary restraint, that the problems of their proper punishment and moral reclamation can best be studied. Still, I must not be understood as agreeing that such classification is the best that could be adopted for a convict establishment. My knowledge of each class of criminal to be found in these prisons convinces me that the most irreclaimable thief is often the best conducted individual in the place; and from this seeming inconsistency between an ingrained criminal disposition on the one hand, and an apparent excellence of behaviour while undergoing the rigours of penal discipline on the other, I draw the argument in favour of a classification that would remove such men from really well-conducted prisoners less hardened in crime.

In one of our later discourses I shall deal more fully with the subject of proper prison classification.

To describe the ordinary criminal so that he may be seen in every phase of his immoral individuality, will necessitate the giving of such particulars of his schemes of crime as some may possibly object to, on the grounds of a too close examination of an undesirable subject. But in the interests of that society against which he wars, as well as for the ultimate good of the criminal himself, it appears to me to be necessary to expose such of the general thieving *modus operandi* as I have learned from my forced association with professional criminals; and I am persuaded that this can be done without in any way encouraging crime or trenching in the least upon a due regard for the ordinary decencies of expression. Many crimes are committed as much through the prevalence of a careless handling and a needless display of wealth by the moneyed class, as through the stealing

propensities of the thief. The astounding "simplicity" of other classes in society affords yet another field for the operations of criminal minds. The victims of long firms, bogus banks, insurance swindles, confidence-trick workers, begging-letter writers, card sharpers, and the rest of the "magsmen" fraternity, are mostly themselves responsible for the crime thus perpetrated; and an *exposé* of how they allow themselves to be deluded by these subterfuges may possibly reduce the number of offences under such heads in future.

Again, there is a class of crime upon which I intend to touch that is seldom brought to light in the police courts, owing to the stigma which, upon its discovery, attaches to those who allow themselves to become its victims. It is most prevalent in London and other large cities, and trading upon it becomes the *rôle* which those superannuated gaol-birds play who know how willing any man who falls into their traps would be to allow himself to be blackmailed rather than become ruined in character by the publicity which a prosecution would entail. Hence a lucrative but infamous game is played with almost perfect impunity by thieves who are no longer able to carry on the schemes of their earlier criminal days.

We may possibly be able to render some little service to the public, and perhaps to the morals of society as well, while we are shut up here, by a few lectures on these phases of criminal life, which can see the light of the outer world by and by; while our exposition of the plans and dodges of professional theft may save many a poor wretch not yet fallen from the frightful penalty of penal servitude.

But all our evening talks shall not be upon men and things exclusively criminal. We will reveal, in some of our discourses, whatever little silver lining there is to be found behind the dark cloud of imprisonment. True, this will be but a negative description of penal consolation. All is not despair and heart-ache within stone cells, even with daily tasks of forced labour,

and a consciousness of years of loss of liberty added. Among so many thousands of unfortunates, all humanity is not of a repulsive nature; and it will be a pleasure to dwell upon such traits of character as have fallen under my observation which show that all is not lost to moral sense and honour beneath the ban of penal servitude.

Thus progressing from bad to better we shall come to the wider and more congenial field of society beyond these walls, and inquire into those of its conditions of social organisation which beget not only the larger part of the crime we shall have to dwell upon by and by, but the mass of wretchedness and poverty that presses upon the lives of millions who work, but who have to surrender too much of their earnings and their liberties to those who neither toil nor spin. We shall conclude, as I have already indicated, with an endeavour to point out how those blessings of liberty and peace, so long and ardently yearned for by true reformers, but "still imprisoned in an imperfect freedom," may be evolved from existing political and social systems, and brought within the reach and enjoyment of all.

amusing efforts to peck the marks from off the slate. He would "fetch and carry" as faithfully as any well-trained dog. Towards evening he would resort to his perch, the post of the iron bedstead, and there remain, silent and still, till the dawning of another day, when his chirrup would again be heard, like the voice of Nature, before the herald of civilisation, the clang of the prison bell at five o'clock.

One evening as "Joe" sat upon his perch, it occurred to me to constitute him chairman and audience of a course of lectures; and with him constantly before me as the representative of my fellow creatures, I jotted down what I have substantially reproduced in the following pages.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1

LECTURE I.

Introductory—A Burglar's Definition of Natural Law—Robbing a Thief— Criminal Physiognomy—Murder in its relation to other Crimes— Conduct of Murderers in Penal Servitude—Classification of Criminals in a Convict Prison—Flogging a Lawyer—Crimes represented in Class I.	9
--	---

LECTURE II.

CLASS II. THE THIEVOCACY.

"Honourable" Thieves—Criminal Ambition—A Sham Hero Burglar— Yarn of "Flash Johnson"—Accomplishments of Burglars—Market Price of Booty—Women Accomplices—Their Plans of Theft—Self- sacrifice	16
--	----

LECTURE III.

Professional Swindlers—Long Firm Workers—Exploits of an Accom- plished Rogue—He runs a Long Firm—Cheating a Home Secretary in the Home Office—Using the Name of His Grace of Argyll—How to Advertise a Quack Nostrum	23
--	----

LECTURE IV.

Snide Pitchers—Disparity of Sentences—Methods of a French Artist— Palming Method of Passing Base Coin	31
---	----

LECTURE V.

CLASS III. MAGSMEN.

Crime included in this Class—What combines to make a Magdman—Tries to deceive even Prison Officials—His Conduct in Prison—Endeavours	
---	--

	PAGE
to Prey upon other Prisoners—His "Religious" Dodges—He Plays the Unfortunate "Aristocrat," the Neglected "British Soldier," &c. —The Card Sharper—The Three-Card Trick Swindle Explained	3.

LECTURE VI.

CLASS III. MAGSMEN (*continued*).

The "Confidence" Trick Swindle Explained	40
--	-----	-----	-----	----

LECTURE VII.

CLASS III. MAGSMEN (*continued*).

The Begging-Letter Writer—His Demeanour in Convict Society—His College Days—How Managed by the Governor—The Begging-Letter Writer's Accomplishments—Knowledge of Aristocratic Scandal—How he Lays his Plans—How Executed—Injury done by these Frauds to the Deserving Respectable Poor—"The Sanctimonious Fraud:" Real Ministers of the Gospel in Prison—Their usual Crime—The Sham Minister—His Account of Himself—His "Misfortunes"—Sectarian Animosity Supplies the Bogus Divine with his Field of Operation—The un-Christian Character of this Feeling—"The Rev." Mr. Blank—His Conversion to Catholicity—Re-conversion to Protestantism	44
--	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

LECTURE VIII.

MAGSMEN (*continued*).—BOGUS NOBLEMEN.

"Sir Roger Tichborne"—The Claimant's advent to Dartmoor Society—His Status therein—A recognised Authority on all matters—His Insubordination—Difference between his conduct and that of self-acknowledged Shams—His knowledge of French and acquaintance with Catholic Ritual—Samples of his Political Education—Dr. Kenealy's reference to the Claimant's Classical Knowledge—Another explanation—Impressions made upon Prisoners—The Claimant's explanation of the cowardly attack upon a lady witness—Charges the Jesuits with his ruin	51
--	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

LECTURE IX.

BOGUS NOBLEMEN (*continued*).

The Aristocratic Impostor—His Qualifications—How the Oracle is Worked—Exploits of "M. le Duc de Montmethuail," Relative of the House of Bourbon-Orleans	60
---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

LECTURE X.

CLASS III. MAGSMEN (*continued*).

Aristocratic Impostures (<i>continued</i>)—Their Select Party in Dartmoor—Adventures of Bertrand Ashley, <i>alias</i> Count von Ostrogg, von Sobriski, &c.	67
--	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

CONTENTS.

xi

LECTURE XI.

CLASS III. SECTION 2. "HOOKS."

	PAGE
General Characteristics—Difference between Hooks and "Snatchers"—Influences which Nourish the Pickpocket Class—Professional Pride—The Cadger-Thief Repudiated—"The Man of the World"—His Accomplishments—Lady Hooks—How they Work—The Scientific Method of Pocket-picking—The various Dodges of the Hook	... 75

LECTURE XII.

CLASS III. HOOKS (*continued*).

"Chucking a Dummy"—How Places of Worship are occasionally "Surprised"—"Snatchers" constitute the Youth of a Prison—How "Brought Out"—Their Places of Resort—The Pestilent Influence of the Literature of Rascaldom—How Honest Boys are made Thieves—The Thief-Cadger—His Schemes 81
--	-----------

LECTURE XIII.

CLASS IV.

THE "BRUISER:" His Photo—What other Criminals think of him—His Accomplishments—How he Works his Game—His Attack on Warders.	
THE "BOUNCE:" The "Injured Husband" Trick—The Lady Accomplice—The Class from which Victims are Selected—How the Black-Mail is Levied—Extent to which this Game is carried on.	
THE "COMMON BOUNCE:" Infamous Nature of this Crime 83

LECTURE XIV.

Provincial Thieves—Professional Jealousy—Foreign Thieves 94
--	-----------

LECTURE XV.

Miscellaneous Traits and Practices of Criminal Character—Demand for New Penal Legislation—Petitioning the Home Secretary—The Thief on "his Rights"—Malingering—Putting on the "Barmy Stick"—Diamond cut Diamond—How to detect Simulated Insanity—Mick Flanagan and the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland—Injury done to <i>bond fide</i> Invalids by "Faking"—Fatal Results to the Malingers themselves 98
--	-----------

LECTURE XVI.

CRIMINAL VANITY.

Inscriptions on the Walls of "the Waiting-for-sentence Cell" in Newgate—The Love-Letter— <i>Slang</i> : Specimen of Thieves' Latin—Key to same 104
--	------------

LECTURE XVII.

PRISON "POETS."

	PAGE
Chateaubriand's Theory—Effective Criticism of the Governor—The Creative Muses of Newgate, Millbank, Dartmoor, and Portsmouth—Circumscribed Nature of the Poet's Opportunities—Jones, his Lucy, and the Critic—Unwarranted Poetic Licence—Crutchy Quinn Celebrates Seven Prisons—His Autobiography—The Millbank Poet who beat Shakespeare—His subsequent more Congenial Exploits in Dublin—A Portsmouth School of Poetry—The Muse among Bricks—A Bread and Water Criticism	110

LECTURE XVIII.

DESPAIR AND HOPE IN PRISON.

Fortitude of Ordinary Convicts—Effects of "Solitary" at Beginning of Sentence—Millbank and Big Ben—Horrible Consciousness of Slow March of Sentence—An Instance of Sudden Madness—Death from Want of Hope—A Midnight Tale of Heart-Sorrow—A Murderer's Extraordinary Hope—Story of Drunkenness and Murder—Convict Castle-Builders	119
---	-----

LECTURE XIX.

CONVICT READING AND FAVOURITE LITERATURE.

Influence of Literature upon Criminal Minds—Suggestions for a Prison Library—Criminal Aversion to Direct Religious or Moral Teaching—The Periodical Literature of a Prison Library—The Religion of Criminals in Prison	128
--	-----

LECTURE XX.

PRISON ANECDOTES.

In the Wrong Hotel—Negative Definition of a Gentleman—Unappreciated Merit—Cause for an English Revolution—How an Irish Republic Lost an English Advocate	134
--	-----

LECTURE XXI.

THE PUNISHMENT OF PENAL SERVITUDE.

Brief description of Penal Servitude by Lord Kimberley's Royal Commission—Disciplinary Classification of Convicts—Evils of and Remedies for Present System—"Solitary" in its Relation to Deterreny—Penal Colonies—Re-Convicted Criminals—Circumstantial Evidence at Fault—Non-Discriminating Discipline—Anomaly in Sentences—Summary of Penal Servitude	152
---	-----

LECTURE XXII.

EDUCATION AS A PREVENTIVE OF CRIME.

	PAGE
Imaginary Flight from Prison—A Scene en route—Confines of London—Crime Germination—Children in Slums and Workhouses—The Remedy—Reformatory Institutions—Combination of the Kindergarten, Elementary Schools, and Manual Instruction—Their Management—The Class of Children to be Rescued—Evidence of the Efficacy of the Kindergarten—An Appalling Fact—Twelve Hundred Paupers, Vagabonds, and Criminals traced for origin to the Children of one Abandoned Woman—The Shelter Schools of France—The Higher Work of Reformatory Institutions 175

LECTURE XXIII.

THE EDUCATION OF THE WORKING CLASSES.

Some Consequences of Defective Education—Contrary Results of Various Public Educational Media—Waste of Capacity—Shelter Schools—Reforms of Elementary Schools—The Royal Commission's Report on Technical Instruction in France—Specification of Instruction given—Length of School Hours—The Defective Education of Girls—Reforms required—Higher Elementary Schools required—Free Meals for School Children—Specialisation of Technical Instruction—Enlargement of the Scholarship Incentive—Creation of Popular Universities—Double Character of Work—Day and Evening Classes—Scholarships open to Day and Evening Pupils alike—Provisions for Orphan Scholars—The Item of Cost—Note 189
--	------------

LECTURE XXIV.

RATIONAL RECREATION AS A PREVENTIVE OF CRIME.

The Free Libraries' Act—Necessity for its Compulsory Application—Loans of Books from Large to Small Libraries—Museums and Art Galleries—Peel Park Library and Museum, Salford—Unsatisfactory Classification in Museums—Exceptions in the Indian Department of South Kensington—Loans from Large to Small Museums—Travelling Lecturers—Art Galleries—Absurd Division of Subjects—Loans of Pictures and Statuary from Large to Small Galleries—Popular Lectures—Advantages of Extending same to Country Districts—Popular Music and Concerts 203
--	------------

LECTURE XXV.

CAUSE OF POVERTY.

Contrasts of Wealth and Poverty—Why are the Poor so very poor?—The Drink Theory—Little or no Inducement for Thrift—Wages kept to a semi-starvation point by Competition and Monopoly—Diminution of Population not Increasing Wages—Relations of Land and Labour—How Land Monopoly has robbed Labour in Ireland—Industry ground down to the Bare Living Point of Remuneration—

"Population Tending to Overtake the Means of Subsistence" fallacy exploded as regards Ireland—Monopoly's Dictum to Labour—The same Principle behind the whole Industrial System—Power and Privilege robbing Labour and manufacturing Poverty—Abolition of Land Monopoly absolutely essential to the Diminution of Poverty	PAGE 214
---	----------

LECTURE XXVI.

REMEDIAL PROPOSALS.

The Abolition of Land Monopoly—Prof. Newman's Opinion—The Advantages of National Proprietary, or State Ownership of Land—National and Individual Benefit—How it would tend to increase Wages—Lord Derby and the Sands of Boobie—How National Proprietary would put an end to Speculative Land Values—The effect of throwing tied-up Land open to Labour—Increasing Food Produce, and enlarging the Field of Industry—Collateral Public Benefits—The Incidence of the Land Tax—Contrast between Class and State Ownership—Conditions of Occupancy under State Ownership—The Position of the Farmer under same—Practically the Owner of his Holding subject to just Conditions—How the Agricultural Labourers would benefit through State Ownership—Summary of benefits to the Community from State Ownership	... 222
---	---------

LECTURE XXVII.

RIVAL REMEDIAL PROPOSALS.

Prefatory Observations—How the Landlords have treated the People—How it is Proposed that the People should treat the Landlords—Direct and Indirect Robbery of the People—The Remedy of Peasant Proprietary—Its Inefficiency—Tending to Extend the Evil of Private Property in Land—Political and Economic Objections—Why the Tories are in Favour of Peasant Proprietary—How this System would still rob the Community—Various other Objections—Would practically Exclude the Labourers from becoming Landowners—This System but Landlordism in another Form—Dr. Russell Wallace's Remedy—Its Defects—The Financial reform Association Remedy—Asks People to Demand 4s. in the £ when entitled to 20s.—Only Just and Efficient Remedy in National Ownership of the Fee-Simple of all Land	... 234
---	---------

LECTURE XXVIII.

THE ORGANISATION OF LABOUR.

Existing System of Production and its effect upon the Interests of Labour—The Wages of Labour—Similarity in effect between Monopoly in the Agencies of Production and Monopoly in Land—Co-operative Production—John Stuart Mill on Property in Land and Industrial Co-operation—How Co-operative Production might be initiated—Industrial Partnerships inadequate—Whitmore Collieries' Experiment a Failure—Maison Leclair more successful—Only final solution of Labour Question in complete Co-operative Production	246
---	-----

CONTENTS.

xv

LECTURE XXIX.

STATE SOCIALISM.

	PAGE
State Organisation <i>versus</i> State Regulation of Labour—Individualism <i>versus</i> Communism—Growth of State Socialism—Beneficial Results—Comparative Risks of Labour and Capital—Insurance on Workmen's Lives should be paid out of Profits of Capital—Necessity for further State Regulation—Co-operative Functions of Municipalities—Natural Evolution of State Functions	255

LECTURE XXX.

STATE OWNERSHIP OF RAILWAYS.

Professor Jevons on the Functions of the State in relation to the State Ownership of Railways—Objections considered	267
---	-----

LECTURE XXXI.

GOVERNMENT BY PRIVILEGE AND WEALTH.

Monopoly of Power by Privilege and Wealth—Obstruction to Social Reforms—Constitution of the British Parliament—"Vested Interests" in the House of Lords—"Vested Interests" in the House of Commons—Interests of Labour consequently Obstructed—Opposition to payment of Members—Just Distribution of Political Power dependent upon a more Equitable Distribution of the Products of Labour—Evil results of existing Distribution of Political Power—"After Sedan"—Inhumanity of War—Impoverishment caused by War—Cost of War to Tax-payers—Formation of European Labour Party check upon War—Effects of just Distribution of Political Power—British Rule over Dependent Nations—British Officialism in Ireland and India—Testimony of Sir James Caird—A Model Magistrate—Immediate Practical Remedies	273
---	-----

LECTURE XXXII.

POLITICAL CRIME.

A Reminiscence—My "Crime"—Definition of Irish Government—The "Castle" System—England put in the position of Ireland under same—Exploits of the Irish Lord-Lieutenant of England—The Castle training of the Irish-English Chief Secretary—The London "Castle Ring"—Power and Functions of its Members—How England would be governed by Anti-English Irishmen—Political Police and Political Judges—What Englishmen would do if their Country were thus ruled and ruined	29.
--	-----

LEAVES
FROM
A PRISON DIARY;
Or, Lectures to a "Solitary" Audience.

BY
MICHAEL DAVITT,
FOUNDER OF THE LAND LEAGUE.

SIXTH THOUSAND.

LONDON: CHAPMAN AND HALL,
LIMITED.
1885.

RICHARD CLAY & SONS,
BUNGAY,
and Bread Street Hill, London.

Dedication.

TO THE
MEMORY OF THE LITTLE CONFIDING FRIEND
WHOSE PLAYFUL MOODS
AND LOVING FAMILIARITY
HELPED TO CHEER THE SOLITUDE OF A CONVICT CELL;
TO MY
PET BLACKBIRD, "JOE,"
THESE PRISON JOTTINGS
ARE AFFECTIONATELY DEDICATED.

PART I.

CRIMINAL LIFE AND CHARACTER.



LECTURE I.

Introductory—A Burglar's Definition of Natural Law—Robbing a Thief—Criminal Physiognomy—Murder in its relation to other Crimes—Conduct of Murderers in Penal Servitude—Classification of Criminals in a Convict Prison—Flogging a Lawyer—Crimes represented in Class I.

POPE has said—

"Vice is a monster of so frightful mien
As, to be hated, needs but to be seen;
Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace."

If for the last two words in these oft-quoted lines the poet had been able to substitute "then wish to efface," he would have rendered an accurate description of the feelings which contact with the criminal classes evoke in the minds of those who may be compelled to associate with them. If the amount of human vice which Clerkenwell, Newgate, Millbank, Dartmoor, Portsmouth, and Portland prisons (prisons over which my experience extends), shut in for a time from mingling with what is undetected in the external world, could have formed a picture in the mind of the author of the above lines, he would have shuddered a great deal more at its contemplation, and satirist of mankind though he was, he would scarcely have enumerated as one of its weaknesses the possibility of embracing a monster so truly hideous.

Pity, however, is the predominant feeling which so much moral deformity excites in the breast of an ordinary mortal who

is doomed to behold the ruin which it has made of so many fellow-creatures—pity not unmixed with some indignation at the causes that are mainly responsible for the careers of such abnormal beings. But what of the society against which these modern Ishmaelites have turned their hands and schemes of crime? Is it not, in some measure, deserving alike of the attacks to which it is subjected by such a large and dangerous class, and to this reproach upon its vaunted civilisation, for the criminal negligence it has shown towards the waifs and strays of city and town—the children of criminals and of pauperism, whose training in theft and dishonesty has been going on beneath its very eyes until a regular criminal class of hardened and educated thieves and vagabonds demands the existence of an enormous and expensive system of police detection?

One of these educated thieves one day observed to me—“The laws of society are framed for the purpose of securing the wealth of the world to power and calculation, thereby depriving the larger portion of mankind of its rights and chances. Why should they punish me for taking by somewhat similar means from those who have taken more than they had a right to? My dear sir,” said he, “I deny your contention that there is any such thing as honesty in the world at all.” This belief is common to all the types of criminal pursuit. The poverty and squalor in which the children of the poor are reared, the next to total neglect of their moral training at the age when ideas of right and wrong ought to be inculcated by means of precept and example; and the crowning influence of drunken, depraved, or indifferent parents, are the sources from which such education is derived, and out of which two-thirds of the criminal life of these countries has sprung.

The individual to whom I have already alluded was a fellow-worker of mine for nigh two years in Dartmoor. He had, in his younger days, passed through the workhouse; read the pestilent literature of rascaldom which has educated so many

criminal characters in this country; then graduated in the "School" (as the existing reformatories are familiarly termed by thieves), and ultimately became a noted burglar. His reading in prison had been pretty extensive, while his intelligence would have insured him a position in society above that of a labouring man, if it had had a substratum of moral principle to rest upon, instead of the teaching of vicious surroundings and examples which had poisoned his youthful mind. I could not help looking upon it as a very novel experience, for even this grotesque world, to have to listen to a man who could delight in a literary discussion, quote all the choice parts of Pope's *Iliad*, and boast of having read Pascal and Lafontaine in the original, maintain, in sober argument, that "thieving was an *honourable* pursuit," and that religion, law, patriotism, and bodily disease were the real and only enemies of humanity. "Religion," he would observe, "robbed the soul of its independence, while society's social laws, in restraining the desires and faculties given by Nature to man for the purpose of gratification, declared war against the manifest spirit of the law of our being." Patriotism he termed "the idolatry of an idea, in the stupid worship of which the peace of the world, and well-being of its inhabitants, were sacrificed by the law-makers and others who profit thereby." And so on with all other principles and customs that indicate men or society to be progressing towards a higher degree of moral or religious perfection. All men were, according to his conception of man's use of life, but superior animals, and all who warred against the laws which denied to man the gratification of his natural appetites were engaged in an "honourable" pursuit.

I one day missed my labour "chum" from his place in our "push" or gang, and learned that he had "nosed" another prisoner, that is, struck him a blow on that organ, and was undergoing three days' "chokey" (bread and water) for indulging in such a luxury. I asked him, on his release, what he

had done it for, and learned that it was because another prisoner had gone into his cell during his absence and stolen his bread. "But is not thieving an honourable pursuit?" I ventured to object. "Well, yes," he replied; "but I punched him not so much for stealing my bread as for sneaking into my cell like a 'cadger' when I was not there. We people look upon a theft from one of ourselves as you do upon such an act being perpetrated in a church—it is sacrilege against the order."

Human passion and impulse having little or no scope for exercise within the rigid limits of prison discipline, the observation of these disturbing elements of society, when in a state of compression or inactivity, is as interesting to the student of humanity as it is occasionally fruitful of eccentric and mirth-provoking occurrences. The common notion, so prevalent among the novel-reading and other portions of the public, that the criminal classes, or *habitués* of prisons, are all of a Bill Sykes, or similar physiognomic stamp of character, is as untrue and misleading as would be the supposition that all people who go to church must be saints, or, at least, holy people. The cleverest burglars I have ever conversed with, as well as the most noted swindlers with whom I have been in forced association, might pass in society for members of quite opposite professions. The man-brute whom Dickens has portrayed, and whom the comic journals reproduce in their cartoons as the type of the most dangerous criminal order, is not as frequently met with in a convict prison as is generally believed. The closest approach to him in convict society is the cowardly bully who is known by the term "bruiser" in prison slang, and who is usually the hanger-on of some unfortunate creature who supports him out of the rewards of her shame. I have conversed in prison with over twenty, and have been for years a close observer of several other murderers, without being able to trace a predilection to that greatest of all crimes, either in the conduct or facial expressions

of these individuals. Murder might really be what De Quincey has termed one of the fine arts for anything an observer of this portion of prison population could discern in the ordinary shaped heads, general observance of prison discipline, and personal behaviour of most murderers. The really hardened, irreclaimable criminal will never commit a murder. Neither will that nearest approach to Bill Sykes in style of dress and face, the bruiser. Robbery with violence these will commit—thrash a policeman, or give cruel ill-treatment to the wretched beings with whom they cohabit, but they have too wholesome a dread of being “topped” (hanged) to add murder to their list of other accomplishments. Murders occasionally occur in connection with robbery, it is true; but they are as a rule accidental to the perpetration of the latter crime, and scarcely ever premeditated. The most heinous of all offences—murder deliberately intended and planned before commission—is, ordinarily, the offspring of the passions of revenge and jealousy, or the outcome of social or political wrongs; and is more frequently the result of some derangement of the nobler instincts of human nature than traceable to its more debased orders or appetites. Temporary insanity, parental mania (as when mothers or fathers murder their whole family), and infanticide add their quota to this class of crime; but it stands in no relationship, in its ultimate motives, to the other numerous crimes which bring together in a convict establishment such a variety of criminal character.

Taking a convict prison of, say, twelve hundred men (which will be about the average roll of the convict establishments in England), it will be found that six hundred of these pass through their terms of imprisonment with exemplary conduct, that is, without a single report having been made against them for breach of discipline—a discipline probably without a parallel in its treatment of human temper in any other services, civil or military, in the world.

Three hundred more will be reckoned well-conducted prisoners

by the governor, have occasional reports, but none of serious or insubordinate description. Two hundred and fifty more will comprise very troublesome prisoners, that is, men of a refractory disposition and guilty of occasional outbursts, against whom there are frequent reports; while the remaining fifty will be almost entirely unmanageable, desperate in their attacks upon fellow-prisoners, and occasionally upon prison warders, and apparently insensible alike to the kind advice of chaplain or priest, or of any leniency or punishment at the hands of sterner officials. It is by prisoners of the latter class that warders have been occasionally murdered in convict prisons.

Compulsory association with these four classes, into which the whole criminal prison population of England and Scotland may be divided, enables me, after nine years of contact and frequent conversation with hundreds of each class, to form the following observations upon their criminal dispositions or character, and to give the subsequent illustrations of their plans of operation when out of prison.

CLASS I.—A section of this class will never have been in prison before, and will have had no contact, previous to imprisonment, with what is known to the police as "the criminal classes." Forgers, bigamists, men convicted for indecent assaults, men who have been found guilty of systematic fraudulent practices in connection with business or professional pursuits, will belong to this class in prison. Lawyers are occasionally met with in convict dress, and it is but fair to the love of law peculiar to the limbs thereof to state that the prison conduct of the few members of the profession who are detected in crime and convicted is such as ranks them with the best conducted prisoners. There was but one exception to this rule in my experience of this class of convict. He, on one occasion, forgot the use of his tongue in an argument with a warder, and fell back upon "the logic of a blow." Verdict by the visiting director, "two dozen lashes with the cat"—a sentence which,

doubtless, impressed the said lawyer's back very much with the force of new and unanswerable reasoning.

By far the greater portion of the six hundred prisoners, however, comprised within Class I. will be made up of old gaol-birds—men who are thoroughly inured to crime, but who are too familiar with the penalties of insubordination, from former prison experience, to invite extra punishment by coming into conflict with the rules and regulations. All the schemes of theft and swindling that are to be described in future lectures will have professors among this exceptionally well-behaved section of a prison population.

The remaining portion of Class I. will comprise receivers of stolen goods, or “buyers”—men who will have had contact with burglars and other criminals outside—horse and cattle thieves, men convicted for manslaughter, and murderers. Religious, or “parsons’ and priests’” men, as they are designated by ungodly prisoners, are mostly confined to this class, the singular feature of which is this, that although it represents almost every species of crime found in the calendar, and is the one of the four classes from which society has suffered most depredations, the conduct of its members while undergoing penal servitude will more than favourably compare with the highest examples of patience and fortitude known to the student of frail humanity.

LECTURE II.

CLASS II. THE THIEVOCACY.

“Honourable” Thieves—Criminal Ambition—A Sham Hero Burglar—Yarn of “Flash Johnson”—Accomplishments of Burglars—Market Price of Booty—Women Accomplices—Their Plans of Theft—Self-sacrifice.

CLASS II.—To this class belong both the higher and middle ranks of the aristocracy of crime—professional burglars, “honourable” thieves, professional swindlers, members of the “long firm,” and dealers in “snide” (base coin). Ninety per cent. of this class will have more or less acquaintance with minor imprisonment before entering penal servitude, while many “professors” will reckon from two to four experiences of convict life. This class looks with contempt upon all “low” thieves, and repudiates the mean or “cadger” order of crime as discreditable to the profession of thieving. They form the most singular and interesting study of all the criminal classes. It is to them that the phrase “honour among thieves” refers. They never “round” upon each other, while they hold all “coppers” (prison informers) in detestation. They are an intelligent class of men, as a rule, though very deficient in common sense and common prudence in the regulation of their ordinary conduct when out of prison. Regard for honesty, religion, or morality they have none whatever, except what portion of the latter virtue may be comprised within the practice not to rob or betray an associate, or operate upon the working or poorer

classes when prosecuting their "honourable" calling in society. Had their earlier years been identified with other than criminal associations, they would belong to the skilled artisan class of Englishmen. All the mechanical work required in a convict prison is performed by their labour.

To be considered a member of this order, and be credited with having done a "big job" in one's time, is the ambition of the less accomplished thieves, and is what they invariably report themselves to be among "flats," *i. e.* the ignorant section of convicts who are outside the "profession." London, of course, supplies the greater portion of this class to the convict prisons, and these metropolitan adepts in crime have a very inferior opinion of all the provincial or foreign artists belonging to the same calling. Numbers of them have travelled abroad, and have tried their hands and tools in Belgium, France, and America. They all agree in the opinion that the latter is the most difficult and dangerous country in which to do a "burst" (burglary). The Yankees are admitted to be very 'cute in guarding their wealth, and make very little scruple in giving the contents of a revolver to any one who ventures for those of a desk or safe. I have conversed with several cracksmen who have been in Egypt, Russia, Turkey, and other foreign lands. Many of them while in prison study French, German, mechanics, and chemistry; and I have found a good few clever linguists among their number. In reply to questions as to why they did not turn their energies and talents to honest and industrial pursuits, their answer, as a general rule, was that there is an amount of excitement and pleasure in the life of a cracksmen unknown in that of an ordinary wage-paid toiler. Efforts to reform this class rarely if ever prove successful. Their good conduct in prison is partly the outcome of a resolve not to bring additional punishment upon themselves, or to prolong their imprisonment by insubordination, and partly the result of experience produced by former terms of imprisonment. They are

generally sold or betrayed to the detectives by the abandoned creatures with whom they spend the "swag" after a successful enterprise. They declare this to be the way in which they are "lagged" (arrested), when not taken in the performance of a "job," and not through the cleverness of the detectives. They consequently hold the fair sex in far less estimation, as human beings, than either Turk or Heathen Chinee.

When a young thief belonging to the next class wishes to pass himself off on a "flat" as a professional, he will ask his auditor if he knows Nobby from the Dials, Jack Somebody from the New Cut, or Bill Something else from Golden Lane; adding superlative slang encomiums to the particular forte of each, and recounting with an I-took-part-myself-in-it air such recent burglaries or clever "lifts" as may have excited unusual interest in the public press.

I well recollect the excitement which the advent of one of these sham heroes to the exercise yard of Millbank caused among the pick-pocket fraternity, after he had announced himself as having got seven "stretch" (years) for clearing out a jeweller's shop in Manchester. He had "planted the swag" (hid the plunder) before being caught, where it would be safe until he was "chucked up" (released), when he would dispose of it in Belgium or Holland, buy a racehorse, and live the life of a swell in future. Lord Wolseley recounting his exploits amid a company of volunteers or new recruits would not excite half the envy which this young thief, who was known as "Flash Johnson," created in the convict circle into which his sentence introduced him. He preceded me to Dartmoor, where I found his fame even more loudly trumpeted than ever, especially by Manchester "hooks" (pick-pockets), who boast of being the rivals of the "Cocks," or Londoners, in the art of obtaining other people's property without paying for it. Unfortunately for fame that does not rest upon actual deeds, and for reputation not genuinely acquired, one of Flash Johnson's

"pals" arrived in Dartmoor one day, in company with a fresh batch of prisoners from Millbank, and brought down the renown of the hitherto worshipped hero to the very dust, by relating that there was not a word of truth in Johnson's yarn; as he had been "lagged" for having "sneaked" a costermonger's barrow and contents! Johnson never lifted his diminished head again during his stay in Dartmoor; and doubtless his ambition upon regaining liberty will be to perform some "great act" which will entitle him to the envy and admiration of his companions in crime.

Not the least efficacious of the remedies proposed for the diminishing of the criminal classes would be the entire separation of the young pick-pockets of first convictions from the criminals I am treating of in this sketch of Class II. while in prison.

I found many of this class to be men of very good address, possessing a fair knowledge of political and passing events, and bearing little or no trace of their following in any of their belongings, except in their use of slang expressions. They would pass in hotels or in railway-trains as men of business among people who would have no experience of criminal character. They may be divided into experts or scientific, and less skilled, thieves. The former make hotels, jewellers'-shops, offices, and mansions where valuable plate is known to be, their field of operation; not despising lower booty should a good chance present itself of obtaining it. They will often spend weeks, and sometimes months, in maturing their plans for a big "burst," and work in partnerships of two or more, as the nature of the "job" may require. To obtain the requisite knowledge of the interior of a place which is "spotted" for operations, the game of "sweethearting the slavey" is gone through by the best-looking member of the gang. If a certain number of interviews with a servant can thus be obtained, it becomes an easy matter to learn the habits of the household, the character for

vigilance of the nearest "bobby," and the other necessary particulars for the successful carrying out of the "burst."

Burglars seldom receive more than twenty per cent. of the value of their booty from the buyers to whom they dispose of it, if it happens to be in any other form than coin. A 10*l*. Bank of England note will but bring 2*l*. from a buyer, while 100*l*. worth of plate would be only worth 15*l*. or 20*l*. to the thief who would risk years of liberty in obtaining it; and so on of all other valuables. If the stories told by these criminals can be credited, many men of apparent stainless character in the commercial world owe most of their wealth to direct dealing with professional thieves.

The less skilled section of this class work in a peculiar manner, generally having a woman as an accomplice. The "lady" is often the direct agent in obtaining the "swag." She is not a prostitute, but cohabits with her partner as long as they are mutually agreeable, and profitable, to each other. The possession of one of these lady artists who may be renowned for cleverness, is an object of much desire and professional wooing among her male admirers. Two essential points in her equipment must be good looks and ladylike address and carriage, as these are the weapons with which she operates. She must, above all things, be well dressed.

Thus "rigged," she makes her descent upon a fashionable jeweller, or dealer in other costly articles of female luxury, often driving to the establishment in a respectable hired carriage. Her plan is to obtain the inspection of as many valuable articles as possible before making a purchase, exhibiting a make-believe well-filled purse, &c., while engaged in examining the goods, then buying a few trifles, and pilfering whatever can be secured without the knowledge of the dealer or shopman. All the arts known to the class of mortals termed "coquettes" may be called into requisition for exercise in an enterprise of this description; while "palming" diamonds, exchanging paste for genuine

jewellery, &c., form additional parts of the lady's accomplishments. The "gentleman" is usually on guard outside, ready to secure the "swag" when "Miss Courtney, of Belgravia," or "Miss Florence Beaumont, of Kensington," shall have completed her purchases and be driven away.

When the male professor tries his hand in his particular line, the lady becomes the aide-de-camp. A Miss Brown, Jones, or Robinson, from London, Manchester, or Glasgow, puts up at some first-class country hotel, watering-place, or other such resort of fashionable people, where numerous guests are known to be staying. A Mr. Wilberforce, or some other respectably sounding name, will arrive a day before or after, at the same hotel, from some city or place in the country, and stay a week or two. No intercourse will take place between the accomplices while in the hotel, at least to the observation of the other guests. The gentleman, after becoming acquainted with the house, and discovering where the parties are located who are believed to have most cash or valuables, will go to work in day or night, as best suits his plans, and with skeleton-keys help himself to whatever plunder may fall in his way. This is usually given to Miss Brown for security, who will be one of the first to report the loss of her purse, or gold watch, after the thief has absconded. As a rule, the proprietors prefer making good the damage rather than allow their hotels to figure in the papers as having harboured such characters, and thereby sustain discredit to its reputation as a safe and respectable house. Miss Brown, Jones, or Robinson leaves, of course, in a few days afterwards, loudly complaining, and resolving never to stay in another hotel without giving her jewels or valuables to the proprietor on her arrival.

The lady thief also lends assistance when a burglary is to be attempted in a street or open thoroughfare, where the "copper" patrols. To do this requires that she shall play the part of an unfortunate, to the extent of parading in the neighbourhood, while she is acting as a sentinel on the policeman, during the

time that her "chums" are making an entrance in, or clearing out, the place selected for the "burst." Should the policeman make his appearance at a critical point of the operation, the woman will feign drunkenness, "go for" the policeman's whisker, and allow herself to be taken into custody, screaming, struggling, and employing other feminine stratagems while in the act of being "run in." She may get seven, fourteen, or twenty-one days in the bridewell for creating a disturbance in the public streets; but her confederates will, in all probability, have succeeded in their little game, through her self-sacrificing action having removed the enemy from the immediate neighbourhood of the enterprise.

LECTURE III.

Professional Swindlers—Long Firm Workers—Exploits of an Accomplished Rogue—He Runs a Long Firm—Cheating a Home Secretary in the Home Office—Using the Name of His Grace of Argyll—How to Advertise a Quack Nostrum.

THE two sections of Class II., thus briefly sketched, may be considered "the criminal upper ten." They are held in the highest estimation by their humbler brethren, who envy the possession of such talents and good fortune as have enabled so many of them to write their names in daring or historic "bursts" in the London weekly press records of burglary fame. They never pick pockets, as they hold such low occupation as far beneath the status of an "honourable thief," as would a duke or a marquis the task of wheeling a barrow. They are generally worn out by the combined effects of imprisonment, intemperance, and disease before they reach fifty years of age.

The remaining section of this class—professional swindlers, members of the "long firm," and utterers of base coin, or "snide pitchers"—may also be ranked as "honourable," inasmuch as they profess only to victimise "those who can afford it, you know." They refuse to sell a comrade or pick a pocket. Like their aristocratic brethren of the "jemmy and file," they will mostly all have put in various terms of previous imprisonments, made up of short sentences in county bridewells; some, of course, counting one or more "laggings," or acquaintances with penal servitude, in addition. As a rule, they are better educated than the members of the preceding class, the "snide pitchers"

excepted. Ignorance would never enable them to prosecute their special callings with much chance of success.

Excepting the "snide pitchers," it would be very difficult to describe the various ways in which these men play upon society. They do not confine themselves to any particular plan in the pursuit of their various professions, and may be said, truly, to live by their wits—like the "magsmen" and begging-letter writers who belong to the next class. Bogus insurance companies and banks; contribution-cards and sheets for obtaining subscriptions towards "charitable or religious purposes;" sham prospectuses in connection with reputed commercial or business enterprises, &c., are among the number of dodges to which they resort for the attainment of plunder. They are the class by which "long firms" are run, and, as is well known, by aid of which confiding individuals or innocent traders are so often "sold," when believing themselves only selling. This "long firm" work is, however, a different kind of swindle to the ones just enumerated, and is so well known to the reading public that any minute description of how the "oracle is worked" is unnecessary.

One man may by himself run a "long firm." Adroitness in laying plans, address in approaching victims, general knowledge of business and money-matters, and a gullible public, are the essential requisites in this branch of professional crime. They are usually well-conducted men in prison; and I have found numbers of them to have once had an honest calling or business at some period in early life, and to have drifted by natural bent, or perhaps failure in their first pursuits, into a life of dishonest adventure. They are all mockers of religion, and, of course, regardless of truth or honour in their conversation or dealings with others. One of them may be taken as a type of the whole class.

During the two last years of my detention in Dartmoor, I was in daily labour companionship with one of these professional

swindlers, and I have listened to many an account of his exploits upon what he styled the “ignorance and cupidity of the public.” His father had been a schoolmaster in the army, and had given his son “Jerry” a very good education. He, however, chose the military in preference to any other life, and ere long, owing to his good conduct and superior intelligence, was promoted to the rank of sergeant. Growing tired in a few years of barrack soldiering he was purchased out, and given a little means with which to push his way in the business world. Removing to London, he soon squandered the few pounds that had been given to him by his father, and being very averse to earning a livelihood by manual labour, he fell back upon his wits, and began to run a “long firm.” In this he was most successful for a time, and acquired sufficient money to get married and live in furnished lodgings; his wife being, according to his apparently truthful account, an honest person, who believed herself to be marrying a city clerk when she took “Jerry” for better or worse. His plan of operation was simplicity itself; a plan which he declared would not have succeeded if those whose goods it brought to his “office” or “warehouse,” did not believe they were about to obtain “a dishonest profit” out of their new London customers. In fact he simply termed it “a game of rogue catch rogue,” or diamond cut diamond. He would forward advertisements to several provincial papers, purporting to relate to a business or agency carried on in the City of London, whereby respectable manufacturers, farmers, &c., in the country could dispose of their goods at large profits, if saleable in London; if otherwise, by shipment to the colonies, or other places abroad. Cattle dealers, grain growers, &c., could also be accommodated, and have their stock disposed of for a moderate commission. Satisfactory references if required. Terms cash, on receipt of goods for shipment or London market. By renting a few cheap rooms in different parts of the city, forging “satisfactory testimonials,”

and prompt disappearance from such of his "offices" as were honoured with goods, and a constant change of plans, "Jerry" succeeded in evading the vigilance of the authorities for a considerable time. He was captured at last, however, fortunately for himself, in some trifling swindle, and without being identified with any of his previous transactions, he was sentenced to twelve months' imprisonment. Upon his release he immediately set about running an insurance company, by which, however, he failed to acquire any considerable amount, owing to several such frauds having been exposed by the police a short time previously. Arrested again upon a charge of obtaining some clothing on false pretences, he succeeded so well in his defence that he was acquitted for want of full incriminating evidence. This escape happened while I was awaiting my trial in Newgate, and among the prisoners with whom I had to exercise while detained in that prison, was "Jerry," who, on this ground, claimed a prison acquaintanceship with me when he was afterwards caught again, sentenced to seven years' penal servitude, and confined in Dartmoor. Within one week after the failure to convict him just alluded to, he carried out successfully the following swindle, which, for coolness of execution and originality of selection in the important matter of a victim, is perhaps unsurpassed by any previous artist in a similar profession. He deliberately walked one day into the Home Office, and requested an interview with the Secretary of State, who at that time was Mr. B——, now Lord A——. On this being accorded, "Jerry" represented himself as a waiter from Willis's, and as having been sent by a gentleman staying there, who was one of Mr. B——'s constituents from A——shire. He, the gentleman, had come up to London on business a few days previously, and had unconsciously emptied himself of all his cash in the business transactions referred to, and found himself, when on point of departure home, without what would either pay his hotel bill, or purchase a railway ticket. To borrow money from those with whom he

had dealt might injure his credit, and acquaintances he had none in London. It occurred to him in this dilemma that he was a constituent of Mr. B——'s; and as he had voted for him at the last election, he might venture to apply to him for the loan of what would extricate him from this little difficulty, which, of course, would be returned immediately on his arrival home. A card with a name and an address was then handed to the Home Secretary by the reputed waiter, which, together with the story told by "Jerry," seemed so satisfactory to Mr. B—— that he expressed his gladness to be able to serve a constituent thus situated. On looking into his purse, Mr. B—— exclaimed, "By Jove, I have not enough change about me. Would a cheque for 10*l.* answer, think you?" "The gentleman only bid me ask for 8*l.*," replied the astute "Jerry," "and I think he would prefer having it in change." Whereupon the Home Secretary called a clerk from a desk, borrowed the requisite amount, and handed it to "Jerry." "I felt quite proud of this exploit," remarked "Jerry," when relating it to me, "to think of the second important individual in the Government being done by me, and in the Home Office too!"

On another occasion he presented himself at one of the principal travelling-bag and portmanteau dealing establishments in Piccadilly, and inquired if the Marquis of Lorne had called there that afternoon and made a purchase? "No; his lordship had not honoured them with a visit," "Jerry" was told; and at once he became the recipient of all possible deferential attention from the shopman. "Strange," replied "Jerry." "His grace the duke told me that the marquis or his purchase might be found here," with which exclamation he left the place. Returning on the following day he handed the attendant, to whom he had spoken the previous day, a paper upon which he had written, in what he styled "an aristocratic scrawl," the following order:—"Messrs. ——, Piccadilly. Please send me, per bearer, two of your fifty-guinea travelling cases for purpose of

selecting one to suit, and forward bill for same, and oblige.—
ARGYLL” “So eager,” remarked “Jerry,” “are London dealers to be patronised by the nobility, that I have always found it comparatively easy to swindle them. In this instance, not only did they not consider the fact that the Duke of Argyll, or any such person of consequence, would never make a purchase in such a manner, but the shopman used his best endeavours to send articles worth 80*l.*, instead of the prices stipulated, and was most anxious to be allowed to forward the bill at some future time. Such obsequious flunkeyism,” concluded “Jerry,” “deserved to be cheated. I walked off with the two bags, and netted 25*l.* by the transaction.” “Jerry” was afterwards surprised in trying on a somewhat similar dodge in the matter of a gold chronometer, and was awarded seven years’ penal servitude for what swindling of his had been detected by the police.

He was exceedingly attached to his wife, who did not repudiate him upon discovering his manner of obtaining a livelihood; and her letters to him while he was in Dartmoor were full of earnest implorings to abandon his former pursuits when his sentence would expire. I was compelled to feel some interest in him owing to many traits in his character which went to show that all was not bad in the man, and from the belief that he might possibly be induced to lead an honest life after being liberated. Being discharged on ticket-of-leave a few weeks previous to my own unexpected liberation, I sought him out a little while after my arrival in London, and found all the statements he had made to me, in relation to his wife and other personal matters, to have been correct. “I promised you,” he exclaimed upon meeting me, “that I would live ‘on the square’ in future, and here is evidence of a commencement,” showing at the same time a copy of the *Daily Telegraph* with an advertisement as follows:—“Wanted, two hundred barmaids.” “That,” remarked “Jerry,” “is simply to arrest the

attention of the fair sex, and cause them to read what follows. 'Extraordinary triumph of science! Marvellous results to health and complexion from the use of Fitzjerry's skin purifier. Freckles and disfiguring marks removed by one phial. To be had only of respectable druggists. Price 1s. 1½d. per phial. The trade also supplied. Prepared only by Fitzjerry, —— Street, London.' " "Is this a real discovery, or merely a quack nostrum?" I ventured to inquire, after reading the above. "Well, it is innocuous, at any rate," said "Jerry," with a smile, "and that cannot be said of most of such compounds. It possesses as much virtue as any of the so-called remedies of a similar description that are purchased in such large quantities by women, who are adventurous enough to try and disguise their years, or vain enough to add to their natural stock of beauty. Thousands of men live well and honestly upon the silliness and credulity of the fair sex, and my elixir is not a particle more of a swindle than the like preparations that are sold all over the country." "Are you making much profit out of the article?" I asked. "So far I have been doing very well," he answered, "and hope to do better in the course of the next few months, after which I may try my hand at something else." "How did you succeed in establishing sufficiently the fame of your 'marvellous discovery' to beget a prompt demand for it? Was it by the mere advertisement of its virtues?" "Not altogether," he replied, laughing, "but by the use of a little stratagem. I employed six young girls for one week at the rate of 10s. each, to perform the following additional advertisement. I assigned to each a certain district in this city, in which every chemist's or druggist's shop was to be visited by one after the other of the girls, and Fitzjerry's purifier asked for. This demand made six times in a few days would, in six cases out of ten, beget an order of at least a dozen phials from each druggist, leaving me a large profit upon every such order." "So this is what you call living honestly?"

"Well, it is safe, anyhow," he rejoined, "and that is, with me, the next consideration to the one of profit. It is as near to honesty as I can go, as yet; and if I am fortunate in this business, I will improve upon its morality by and by."

I had the curiosity to try and see "Jerry" again some twelve months after this episode, and learn how he was getting along, but failed to discover any trace of him at his former residence, or place of business; and I very much fear that the strong natural propensity to live at the expense of the public in some surreptitious manner or other has overcome both good resolution and the deterrent fact of previous imprisonment, and landed "Jerry" once more within the walls of prison. I have, of course, disguised both the name of this individual, and the particular nature of his "honest venture," in the foregoing account of himself and the various schemes by which he played upon what he termed the "ignorance and cupidity of the public." But, with this exception, the remainder of this sketch is literally true.

I have dwelt at some length upon this type of the class of criminals belonging to the section of the best-conducted class of men in a convict prison, because an illustration of the character and schemes of one will apply more or less to the entire order of professional swindlers; and may, perhaps, be the means of warning gullible people against those arts and practices, the successful working of which encourages crime, and swells the penal roll of these countries.

LECTURE IV.

Snide Pitchers—Disparity of Sentences—Methods of a French Artist—
Palming Method of Passing Base Coin.

THE remaining section of Class II., “snide pitchers” (utterers of base coin), present very little of either originality in their plan of working, or ingenuity in the exchange of their own for the coin of the realm. It very rarely happens that a maker is caught, though scores of them are known to carry on their profession in London alone; while each large city in the country has more or less numbers of such manufacturers. I only knew one maker to be amongst the thousands of convicts who came under my notice during my nine years’ experience of penal servitude, though it is, of course, possible that there may have been a larger number in the various prisons in which I was from time to time incarcerated. He was a very intelligent fellow, very well behaved, who had done five years of a “lagging” previous to his then sentence of ten years. In the same prison—Millbank—was a man who had purchased “snide” from the maker alluded to, and was caught in the act of attempting to pass some of it, and, though having no previous conviction against him, he was awarded fourteen years’ penal servitude for this, his first offence. This appeared to me to be somewhat of a “slight mistake” in the administration of justice. Both prisoners were tried at the same Newgate Sessions, but there was no connection between their cases.

As a rule, the “snide” dealers do not carry on any other

species of swindle, nor do they resort to picking pockets, or burglary. Most of them are working men or servants out of employment. Very few make a boast of their particular crime, and I have invariably heard them resolve not to continue it any more after release. They are not, as a rule, an intelligent order of men, but rank much higher in the scale of morality than criminals previously described. Publicans, and gullible people on racecourses, or at other betting places, are their favourite victims, with such other section of the public as chance may throw in their way for an exchange of coin. A little Frenchman who worked with me for a time in Dartmoor was an expert artist in this profession, and might have fared better in the matter of length of imprisonment, when ultimately captured, had some lenient teetotaler been his judge. He made publicans almost his exclusive customers, and always worked upon one plan, which he prided himself upon being as simple as it had proved itself successful on many occasions. With a stock of the best made "suide," that is, cleverly counterfeited coin, with a fair balance of genuine gold and silver in the make-up, he would rush into a public-house or gin palace with head bare, and pen behind the ear, and, as if he had just slipped out of a neighbouring office or establishment, call for a glass of beer or spirits and pay the "damage" with a half sovereign or half-a-crown, in a manner that would as much as say "I have just run out from my desk for this drink, and if I am not back in a jiffy, old quill driver, my employer, will be after me; so please hurry up with the change." Of course a great deal would depend upon the quality and make-up of the article, gold being more difficult to pass than silver; and excitement or presence of a large number of people in a "public" being more conducive to an easy "sell" than under calmer business circumstances.

Another plan adopted by old hands is to tender a genuine sovereign for payment of what is purchased, and require the

change to be in gold and silver ; the "snide" half sovereign is substituted by palming for the good one which forms part of the change, and is rung upon the counter with "Another instead of *this*, if you please," demanded by the knowing customer. Fairs and markets in the provinces are a favourite resort for the snide pitchers, where they not unfrequently "take in" unsuspecting country dealers, as successfully as Moses Primrose was "sold" by the merchant of green spectacles in the *Vicar of Wakefield*.

LECTURE V.

CLASS III. MAGSMEN.

Crime included in this Class—What combines to make a Magsman—Tries to Deceive even Prison Officials—His Conduct in Prison—Endeavours to Prey upon other Prisoners—His “Religious” Dodges—He Plays the Unfortunate “Aristocrat,” the Neglected “British Soldier,” &c.—The Card Sharper—The Three-Card Trick Swindle Explained.

CLASS III.—This class is more diversified in the criminal pursuits of its members than any other, save number one, and forms the most troublesome, though not the most violent or dangerous, body of men in a convict prison. As they are almost all well known to the police authorities when outside, they are in no way anxious to obtain a ticket-of-leave. For this reason they make very little effort while undergoing imprisonment to earn the quantity of marks, by good conduct and performance of task, which entitle the well-conducted prisoner to the remission of a certain portion of his sentence.

They may be divided into two sections: those who employ their wits as weapons, and those who only use their fingers against the public; or, to put it in slang phraseology, “magsmen” and “hooks.” The order of magsmen will comprise card-sharpers, “confidence-trick” workers, begging-letter writers, bogus ministers of religion, professional noblemen, “helpless victims of the cruel world,” medical quacks, and the various other clever rogues that figure from time to time in the newspaper records of crime. It would require a volume to do justice to the character, tricks, and peculiar physiognomy of this section alone. They prey upon all classes, and have no more com-

punction in "besting" one of themselves than in robbing outsiders, while of all criminals they are the most consummate hypocrites and accomplished liars. It is difficult to determine whether nature or civilisation has done most in developing the cheating propensity of the magsman. All the roguery and dishonesty that is begotten of our boasted civilisation superinduced upon all that is deceitful and unprincipled in depraved human nature, would seem to unite in the finished production of one of these rascals.

He puts his professional talents into working gear even in prison, and endeavours to get the blind side of chaplain or priest by apparent sanctity and ready Scripture quotations; to cheat the doctor into admission to the prison hospital by feigning sickness, and enumerating all the maladies that had preyed for years upon all the members of his family; while he will even carry his trickery so far—often too far for himself—as to endeavour to impose upon the governor in the hope of being able to shirk some particularly disagreeable task, or to obtain admission into some light labour, or other privileged work gang.

Failing in any or all of these efforts the magsman becomes the constant grumbler of the prison establishment. He is up before the governor with complaints as frequently as it is prudent to do so, and applies to see the visiting director every month "to show up" the warders for over-doing their duty, the prison baker for under-doing the bread, the cook for making the skilly or shin-of-beef soup too thin, or some other prisoner for giving personal trouble or annoyance. When nearing the termination of his sentence the magsman will endeavour to procure the addresses of friends belonging to any prisoner who may have those outside who would, if possible, lighten the burdens of their imprisoned relatives. Should he succeed in obtaining the least excuse for an introduction, the magsman will represent himself as being in a position to transmit money to his friend languishing in prison, "and thereby help to lighten the remainder of his

sentence by bribing warders into a kind treatment of the poor suffering gentleman who begged him (the magsman) not to forgo his old prison chum when restored to liberty," &c. Several instances of this kind of swindle came under my notice while in Dartmoor, through prisoners' relatives writing particulars of them to those who had been stupid enough to aid in their perpetration.

Magsmen are, as a necessary consequence of their following, the most accomplished in the art of lying of all mortals; but, like all habitual liars or rogues, are very deficient in the important article of memory, and may be easily detected in the falsehood of their story or yarn by those who will but examine closely their narratives and purposes. Still it is easy to account for their swindling success by the knowledge of how prone many persons are to credit the artfully-invented and pathetically-related tales that are poured into their ears or penned for their perusal by an unfortunate "minister of the Gospel," at one time "happy in the Lord," and in the possession of a home for his weak family, but now "meekly bowing to the Divine chastisement in poverty," &c., &c.; or a disinherited son of an unforgiving wealthy parent, "who has been cast off without a shilling for having married below his station," or for the commission of some other offence against aristocratic caste or society rule, but "resolved to hide his ancestral name and family reputation from the scandal-loving public while seeking some assistance for his true and injured partner in life and children, pending happier smiles of fortune," &c.; or the touching appeal of "the ex-British soldier, maimed or otherwise injured whilst serving his country, chiefly in India, and now doomed to live upon the generosity of his countrymen, through an indiscretion by which a pension was lost," &c.; or the engaging manners, polite talk, and graciously-condescending deportment of the general, colonel, captain, or nobleman who is on a venture at a country hotel, or among those who dearly love the patronage of the upper ten.

• It may seldom happen that a magsman is captured for a swindle exactly corresponding with the foregoing descriptions, as few people who find themselves gulled in such a manner care to figure in the public press as being the simpletons which they would have to be depicted in prosecuting a "minister," "baronet," "colonel," or any other sham who might have honoured them with a month's hospitality, or borrowed a paltry 50*l.* while awaiting a remittance from an estate agency or bank; but these exploits are of common occurrence, nevertheless, and form the boast of such of the magsman fraternity as successfully carry them out.

To put the people who are generally victimised by this type of rogue to some extent on their guard, it will be necessary to give a few particulars of their respective plans of operation.

One particular accomplishment is nearly common to all of them—they are admirable judges of character, and seldom fail in selecting the most credulous and otherwise workable individuals in a company, or in any other convenient circumstance, for the victim that is to be fleeced. This forms a necessary part of their profession, and as they make its practice an object of constant application, they become *c* physiognomists.

The Card-Sharper.—This artist, until recent enactments in his regard, was a frequenter of railway trains, and has often victimised young and inexperienced travellers by aid of the three-card trick, but he is now driven to other fields of operation, chiefly country towns and highways, sailor-frequented haunts at seaports, and low beer-shops. He is the least educated of the magsman order, and will not scruple to pick an occasional pocket, or otherwise help himself to anything which fortune may throw in his way. In the preliminary to the introduction of his "two black and one red" game, his conversation will be almost certain to turn upon horse-racing, pedestrianism, fortunes made on the turf, London or Manchester gaming-saloons; after which he finally comes to cards. If the game that follows is to be

played in or near a town, confederates will figure in it. If on a country road, one professional will suffice. When two are "working the oracle," the usual plan is this: One will introduce himself and the game to the company, or knot of men or boys, as the case may be, in something like the manner I have just described, and produce his pack of cards, or three of a pack, two black and one red, or *vice versâ*—this being the number needed for the game. At this point of the proceedings the confederate will come upon the scene and appear deeply interested in the game. The man with the cards offers to bet any gentleman a "tanner" that he will not pick the red card out from the two black ones, which he shuffles. Still speaking, he throws down upon a table, board, or any such object that he may be near, his three cards. The confederate appears very desirous of accepting the challenge—hesitates, seeks advice from the person next to him, declares that a certain card to which he points must be the right one, and finally throws down sixpence, puts his finger upon the card, and obtains the wager. With much ado on the part of the owner of the cards, the successful speculator is induced to bet again, which he reluctantly does, and wins; again, and loses this time, and once more for an augmented wager (the confederate appearing to warm to the sport) of perhaps five "bob" (shillings), and wins. By this time some of the lookers-on will be induced, by what they have seen, to stake a small sum, when they will, of course, be allowed to win, until, sufficiently excited to increase their wagers, it becomes worth the sharper's while to turn the winning on his own side.

The manner in which the trick is performed is as follows. The card sharper holds two cards in the palm of the right hand and one in that of the left; the front one of the former will be the red, and will be held so as to be plainly seen by the audience, and the other two will be the black ones. One of the latter—the one held in the right hand behind the red—will be

cut perhaps the sixteenth of an inch shorter than the other two, so that it can be thrown *from behind the red*, when the cheat is to be performed, into a space on the table or board where the red appears to, and should, fall, if the game were honestly played; while the red remains the last card in the right hand, and is thrown where the black one should fall. When the victim is being induced to speculate he will observe the red card pitched to the right or left, and the two others thrown so that the three will lie face downwards in something like the form of a triangle. As the red will be purposely shown, in the first instance, when flung from the sharper's hand, the speculator will, of course, be able to pick it out from the other two, until he wagers the larger amount, when the red is, as usual, exposed while apparently falling as before, and the black one that is behind it in the sharper's hand is easily flung into the place where the red had previously been thrown, the red relegated to the unsuspected position, and the cheat accomplished.

An experienced hand at this game will be "fly" enough not to win continuously when he gets his victim or victims fully engaged in the speculation, but will allow an occasional victory to be scored against him, so as neither to excite the suspicion of trickery, nor to discourage the interested spectators.

The foregoing particulars of this well-known cheat, anything but well known in its manner of being worked, was given me by one who was admitted by his criminal friends to be especially smart in this branch of a mag'sman's profession. He boasted, among other similar achievements, of having "emptied" a young Etonian of his gold watch and 20*l.* while travelling with his dupe on the short journey from London to Windsor.

This type of criminal is of the hardened species, and is quite irreclaimable, while he ranks the first in the downward course from the class of "honourable thieves."

LECTURE VI.

CLASS III. MAGSMEN (*continued*).

The "Confidence" Trick Swindle Explained.

THIS cheat is such a transparent "sell" that it excites one's astonishment how any mortal is allowed to wander abroad in the world by himself who is capable of being fleeced by its agency.

I will stake my reputation for knowledge of national character that a Jew, a Dutchman, a Yankee, or a Scot, never lost a farthing by means of this most shallow of all artful dodges; yet how many individuals have figured in the police columns of the press (in my opinion deservedly thus pilloried for their asinine stupidity) as prosecutors in such cases!

A "gowk" (countryman) is generally the quarry for whose capture the workers of this little game are always on the alert. The vicinity of the Tower, British Museum, St. Paul's, and other London sights that attract the curious and country-cousin type of visitors to the metropolis, are the most frequent beats of these professors, who are never at a loss to discover their prey owing to the gaping and wonder-at-everything looks of the provincials. The successful performance of the swindle requires two or more confederates, who will keep in sight of each other while on the look out for game, but who will pass and repass each other while thus occupied as if utter strangers. When an intended victim is selected, he is approached by one of the rogues and

asked for some information as to the direction towards, or locality of a certain street, hotel, theatre, &c., the inquirer using such deferential bearing as the apparent wealth or weakness of the victim may invite; stating at the same time that he (the rogue) is a perfect stranger in London, arrived that day from some very remote part of the country, and is completely lost in the surrounding wilderness of stone and mortar. He will, of course, be answered by the real stranger, that he is from the country also, and can give no such information; whereupon a conversation is started, an adjournment to a public-house proposed, and a drink invited—the rogue respectfully requesting the pleasure of treating "the only gentleman who has given him a civil answer since his arrival in London." If this is agreeable to the sight-seer, the nearest low tavern or beershop is selected for the drink, and the game is all but bagged. If the beershop should be a rendezvous for thieves, the robbery becomes quite easy. The stranger's second drink is drugged, his pockets rifled, and himself left to awake a poorer but a wiser man. But if it be an ordinary or respectable establishment, the operation of "maggin the gowk out of his purse" becomes less certain; depending, principally, upon the amount of ignorance which he has carried with him to London, and on the acting and conversational "confidence-inspiring" powers of the gentleman into whose hands he has fallen. While the new acquaintances are in the act of drinking each other's health, the confederate makes his appearance, with an "I hope I am not intruding, gentlemen," and sets about the work of obtaining a closer introduction to the company. In the mean time rogue 1 has baited the trick by exhibiting some "Bank of Engraving" notes, and a flash, well-filled purse of "snide," or gilt coin, out of which he will have taken a genuine half-sovereign with which to pay for the treat; remarking, at the same time, in reference to the amount of supposed money just exhibited, "that a man cannot come to London to enjoy

himself, you know, without putting a few pounds of spending money in his pocket."

The turn which the conversation will now take must mainly depend on chance, the two rogues, however, measuring their victim both as to his comparative clownishness and financial condition. Pending the introduction of the business portion of the confidence comedy, rogue 2 will launch out against London dishonesty in general, and declare that he is compelled to put his purse and watch under his pillow in the hotel where he is staying, and to carry the former in his breast-pocket when walking in the streets, for fear of losing both; winding up with the regret that he could place no confidence whatever in these Londoners. Rogue 1 admits the unfortunate lax morality of a great number of people in such a large city, but ventures an opinion that a stranger to the metropolis may allow his prejudice or imagination to conjure up dishonesty where none really existed; and that want of confidence in everybody would beget a miserable state of things, and a want of confidence in one's own judgment and common sense among the number. All this time the stranger is but called upon to act the part of a listener, the two rogues carrying on the discussion, and paying for the drink consumed, until eventually rogue 1 carries the argument against his adversary, and declares his willingness to intrust his purse and contents to either rogue 2 or the other gentleman during a period of five or ten minutes' absence from the room, and without requiring any other guarantee for the safe return of his property beyond his own confidence in their observed honour and honesty. Rogue 2 declares this to be handsome on the part of the gentleman who speaks, but thinks that prudence, as well as the observed customs of business transactions, demand that the party in whom such trust is reposed should not accept it without leaving some pledge of his honour in the hands of the confiding gentleman. Therefore, he, rogue 2, will take up the challenge of

rogue 1, providing he (rogue 1) will take the custody of his purse until he (the speaker) comes back ; requesting, however, the company of the other gentleman, the stranger, while he is absent from the room. This course is agreed to by the man of confidence, and the purses are exchanged. The parties absenting themselves return, of course, at the end of the stipulated time, and the first act of the comedy is performed. Another drink, this time at the expense of rogue 2, who insists on treating the gentleman who had honoured him with such confidence, and a similar performance is enacted again by rogue 2 declaring that he will not be outdone in the exhibition of confidence ; and purses are again exchanged between the confederates, rogue 1 being the volunteer absentee in this act, accompanied by the gentleman, his friend from the country. The second act over, it comes to the dupe's turn to show his confidence in one of the two "gentlemen," whereupon the rogue who obtains the custody of the purse vanishes with it, is gone in search of by his friend when the time expires, and the dupe is left alone with the flash purse filled with threepence-worth of gilt sovereigns, and with plenty of food for reflection upon the silly goose he has made of himself.

This confidence trick does not constitute a profession in itself : it is simply one of the accomplishments of a magsman, and may be performed by a card-sharper or any other artist who belongs to the magsman order of professional criminals.

LECTURE VII.

CLASS III. MAGSMEN (*continued*).

The Begging-Letter Writer—His Demeanour in Convict Society—His College Days—How Managed by the Governor—The Begging-Letter Writer's Accomplishments—Knowledge of Aristocratic Scandal—How he Lays his Plans—How Executed—Injury done by these Frauds to the Deserving Respectable Poor—“*The Sanctimonious Fraud* :” Real Ministers of the Gospel in Prison—Their usual Crime—The Sham Minister—His Account of Himself—His “Misfortunes”—Sectarian Animosity Supplies the Bogus Divine with his Field of Operation—The un-Christian Character of this Feeling—“The Rev.” Mr. Blank—His Conversion to Catholicity—Re-conversion to Protestantism.

BEGGING-LETTER WRITERS.—These are “the people of quality” in a prison, and, together with “the scions of the nobility,” to be described by and by, constitute the would-be *crème de la crème* of its society. I have passed many an amusing half hour, during Sunday exercise, in simply observing the walk, bearing, and aristocratic airs assumed by these individuals; and have often had to listen to their stories of “family intrigue,” “fortunes lost on the turf,” &c., &c., by means of which the narrators were ruined, and consigned to prison by unscrupulous relatives, or through the mad follies of youth and pleasure. They never admit their real calling when in conversation with other prisoners, but invariably represent themselves as belonging to good families in society, by whom, or some members of which, or by their own freaks, they have been ruined. But in order to screen the family name from the reproach of having had a representative a convict, they have assumed another name as a *nom*

de prison, &c., &c. When it is safe to do so they put on airs too, and look down upon the thieves who are honest enough to avow their professional pursuit, and who, in their turn, treat their *soi-disant* superiors as an Arab would handle a Jew, or with something like the contempt that a South Carolina planter of the old school would listen to the family pedigree of a gentleman "of colour." Whether they need them or not, these amusing frauds will exhaust all the forms of a prison to obtain a pair of spectacles. These adjuncts to intellectual physiognomy lend an air of respectability and learning to their wearers, and assist them in the rôle which they are desirous to sustain among their convict associates. As a rule they are a troublesome type of men for prison officials to deal with, exceedingly averse to anything approaching hard labour, but having a similar detestation for the diminution of rations served to men at minor laborious tasks. They are consequently known among other prisoners as "doctor's and governor's men"—that is, men who are constantly complaining and seeking favours or more agreeable forms of occupation. They are eventually relegated to some sedentary employment, such as tailoring, shoe-making, or stocking-knitting, where they pass the remainder of their imprisonment in the enjoyment of their reputed family distinction and respectable belongings in the outer world.

The governor and other superior prison officials have, of course, a thorough knowledge of criminal character, and know how to deal with each class and type in the manner most conducive to the maintenance of prison discipline. Every prisoner is privileged to see the governor whenever he has a complaint to make, or a reasonable application to submit; but a too frequent exercise of this privilege upon trivial or ridiculous excuses, is, of course, provocative of annoyance, and a source of unnecessary trouble to the prison staff. I have known the governor to have "choked off" (successfully humbugged) dozens of these frequently complaining and contemptible impostors by

expressing his surprise at "an educated man giving such trouble without cause"—a compliment which was, of course, related to every individual who came within talking distance of the recipient during the remainder of his "lagging." They are a very well-informed class of men, as a rule; numbers of them having received portions of legal or other professional education; while ex-schoolmasters, broken-down tutors, "spoiled" ministers, and questionable lawyers are found among their number. They are all past middle age. Most of them will have undergone short terms of imprisonment, before entering upon convict life, not necessarily for having been guilty of the begging-letter fraud, but for that or any of the other swindles already or hereafter to be specified as belonging to the general profession of a magsman. They will not pick pockets, or undertake burglary, but will work a bogus insurance company, run a long firm, or engage in any similar undertaking. Should several of them meet in one "push" (labour party) in a prison, they will aid each other in the support of their assumed rank, and speak of "that unfortunate poor devil, register No. A. 2,000, who squandered a fortune on the turf, or in Baden-Baden; or who moved in good society the time I first made his acquaintance, a few years after I had graduated in Cambridge, &c., &c." They are easily distinguished among the mass of other prisoners, not altogether by their airs or their "distinguished extraction," but chiefly from what constitutes their stock conversation, namely, the pedigrees and concerns of the English and Scotch nobility. There is scarcely a member of the House of Lords or other titled personage in Great Britain whose family history, particulars of wild freaks of male, or *faux pas* of female members, and general scandal thereto belonging, I have not listened to in my Sunday and daily exercises in Dartmoor, from members of the begging-letter fraternity. This intimate knowledge of the family doings of the upper ten of society is the essential part of the begging-letter impostor's profession, without which he

would be no more capable of swindling in his peculiar line than would a man who had never been to sea be able to regulate the rigging of a merchantman. This education acquired, by the study of works on the peerage, regular perusal of the fashionable intelligence columns of the daily papers, and from other kindred sources, the fraud is perpetrated in something like the following manner :—

We will suppose that one of these characters has just read in the *Court Journal*, or other aristocratic organ, an item like the following :—“Fashionable marriage at St. James’s, Hanover Square, on the 20th inst. The Honourable Gustavus Fitzswell, son of Viscount Fitzswell, of Berks, to Georgina Eleanor Victoria, eldest daughter of Sir Eustace Moneybags, of Grosvenor Square, London.” Here follows, of course, the list of those present at the marriage ceremony, and of all whom Sir Eustace entertained at breakfast or lunch with the bride and bridegroom ; particulars of presents given to the bride ; and the usual piece of interesting intelligence “the happy couple left by an early train for Torquay, or somewhere else, there to spend the honeymoon.”

This paragraph is to the begging-letter writer what a surface indication is to a gold-seeker on the Rocky Mountains, or an unsuspecting country visitor to London with plenty of spending money and lots of “confidence” to the professional who gives lessons in that branch of education for an exchange of purses. The paragraph is immediately copied on a slip of paper, threepence invested in writing materials, and the scene changes to some miserable room in an upper story of some lodging-house in Drury Lane, Whitechapel, or Soho, in London. A greasy well-thumbed book is diligently looked through in search of the names “Fitzswell” and “Moneybags,” and also for those of such distinguished personages or people of wealth who may have been among Sir Eustace’s guests ; and the various particulars of the family history of each will be diligently read over

and committed to memory, after which the interested student will carefully lay his plans, and proceed to work. He may fix upon either of the happy pair, or both, or their (of course) no less happy parents; or some one of the guests, or half-a-dozen, as his game; circumstances determining both the extent of and particular plan for accomplishing the intended swindle. A carefully-worded letter is written that will detail a distressing story of some unfortunate mishap as having occurred in connection with sickness and the loss of business, situation, patronage, or previous respectable occupation of the writer; entailing, in consequence, great hardship upon himself, his wife, and a very young family. The principal misfortune may be represented as having resulted from failure in business, after the retirement from the service of some of the families concerned in the recent marriage (names and particulars being added), or from being deprived of the position of steward, footman, valet, &c., through some trifling fault, age, or other mitigating circumstance. Another start in business is contemplated, the nature of which will be explained, and his recent mistress or master, or both, have kindly and generously headed the following list with a donation of 5*l*. Names and amounts of donations will then be added, an address given, and an intimation tendered that the smallest help will be gratefully acknowledged; and the letter is forwarded to its destination. Care will, of course, be taken not to send the list of "generous donations" to any party whose name already figures thereon, while the appeal will be made as respectable, pathetic, and genuine-like as possible.

Instead of a marriage, the inspiring paragraph may have referred to a party of guests entertained at some nobleman or merchant's residence in the country—a dinner after a hunt, or other such usual occurrence in connection with the world of wealth or fashion.

The writer may elect to hint himself a distant relative of some of the personages taking part in the particular event that

has brought such people together; and in making a genteel appeal, lay special stress upon the point that he would a thousand times prefer taking his wife and children into an almshouse than that his relative, General, Colonel, or Captain Somebody, or the member for Stonehenge, should hear of the means to which he was compelled to resort to keep his family from starving.

Scores of other devices are employed by this fraternity in preying upon feelings of human sympathy, which, in consequence of such criminal practices, are often steeled against genuine and deserving domestic or individual suffering, or the alleviation of helpless poverty.

Numbers of these magmen travel through the country, and by intercourse with servants in large houses, and listening to the gossip of village inns, are enabled to carry on a safer, and probably more profitable, "business," than that pursued by the city professors of the same calling. Another species present themselves in person to known charitable people in cities and towns, and by artful representations and an exhibition of the list already apparently patronised with small contributions, succeed in defrauding the open-hearted and generous.

So long as human pity is capable of being put in motion by the calamities that are incidental to the lives of the unfortunate, these begging-letter impostors will be more or less successful in their depredations upon society; and one is therefore far from desiring anything like a crusade against even unconscionable rascals that would be likely to involve the honest, needy, and really afflicted in an indiscriminating suspicion and repudiation at the hands of the public.

Sanctimonious Frauds.—This class of crime is not largely represented in convict society; but I have been informed that it is oftener found in county prisons, and is usually associated with the preceding and kindred species of swindling. I regret to have to say that I have known several *bonâ fide* ministers

of religion who were convicts; their crime, as a general rule, being bigamy, but as they are not a type of habitual criminal, nor their special offence one of a recurring nature, I have grouped them in the first section of Class I. Their presence in any branch of criminal life or class of prison association is a sad commentary upon the morals of modern society, and has often supplied an apposite argument to those of the intelligent, irreformable offenders, who love to scoff at the idea of an honest or moral principle regulating the conduct, or guiding the motives, of any portion of civilised mankind.

The bogus divine might be termed a religious *chevalier d'industrie*. He has probably a better verbal knowledge of Scripture than many a surpliced occupant of a pulpit, with a face capable of expressing such a degree of unctuous piety as would do credit to the most fervid enthusiast at a religious love-feast. As the lay members of his (the magsman's) profession prey upon the simple and inexperienced amongst sinners, the sacerdotal impostor selects his victims from amongst the over-credulous portion of saints. The presence of that unfortunately too generally infused "Christian charity," which the poet has aptly termed "the hating of each other for the love of God," is the source of this among the many other evils which flow from the religious animosities of rival sects. The most hardened sinner that ever repudiated or trampled upon the whole decalogue by sinful and scandal-giving conduct is not one-hundredth part as welcome to "the path of repentance"—be it within the fold of church, chapel, or meeting house—as the Scripture-searching, conscience-troubled individual who has discovered some flaw in the theology or innovation in the ceremonial of his previously acknowledged religion, and who declares he has at last found out and selected to follow "the true path." This blind zeal in behalf of sect is believed by those who manifest it to be a laudable feeling in the interests of true religion, and is, of course, common to all Christian denominations, without ex-

ception; and therefore opens up an extensive field for those adepts in simulated sanctity, "converted truth-seekers," and "reformed divines," some of whom are occasionally found in a convict prison.

Like the begging-letter writer, the "converted minister" is (to his prison auditors) of "good family extraction;" had; at least, a college education, and has either been awfully sinned against by wicked men, or has fallen into his present prison misfortune through some cause which requires the relation of his whole family history, or personal mistakes, to explain. Anything approaching to a truthful statement of what they really did to get into prison it is impossible to learn from their own lips.

Like the individuals previously sketched, these divine magmen aid each other in the support of their fictitious characters while in prison, and talk of such a prisoner being a Cambridge man, and such another as having taken honours at Oxford, while some other has been a chaplain in the army. One of these most accomplished rogues introduced himself to me one day in Dartmoor (it having happened that accident threw us together at exercise) and afforded me a half hour's amusement. "An extraordinary deputation, consisting of several M.P.'s, and other influential gentlemen, waited upon the Home Secretary last week," he at once began, "and made use of the following argument in my behalf:—'Sir, we, in common with the rest of the public, have observed how much the Government has done towards the liberation of the Fenian prisoners, with which leniency we entirely agree; but we have watched in vain for anything being done on behalf of the Rev. Mr. Blank, whose case excited so much interest a few years ago in London society. We trust, therefore, sir, that his hitherto unblemished reputation, the fact that his offence was not of a nature to injure public morals, and the three years' confinement he has already undergone, together with the deep sympathy that is felt for him by

a wide section of intimate friends, will soon earn for him *at your hands* that considerate remission of sentence which has lately restored so many other prisoners to their families and friends.' Yes, sir," he added, "I expect my discharge will be brought down by the visiting director next month, as the Government cannot afford to *slight* such an extraordinary deputation."

"Are you the rev. person that is interceded for?" I inquired.

"Yes. I was convicted for the alleged destruction of some title-deeds to property—a ridiculous supposition; as the papers would have established my own indisputable claim to what had been in the possession of my family for generations."

"Where did you officiate as priest?"

"Oh! I was a minister of the Established Church," he replied.

"Then why do you attend the Catholic chapel, here?" I asked.

"Well," he answered, "I could not bear the preaching of the Protestant chaplain in — Prison; and I was ordered one day by an assistant warden to *kneel down on both knees*, so I saw the director, and became a Catholic."

Cutting off one's nose to spite the remainder of the face is nothing in comparison to a man turning from a Protestant to a Catholic in order to save his knees. A few months after the conversation just alluded to I missed his reverence from the Catholic chapel, where he had been a regular weekly communicant, as well as member of the convict choir; and upon exercising my curiosity as to what had become of him when I next had a visit from Father Green, I learned that the Rev. Mr. Blank had again troubled the director in a matter of conscience, and had become a Protestant once more. "Because," remarked Father Green, "I had refused to recommend him to the governor for employment in the prison bakehouse!" Until the expiration of his sentence Blank was a constant monthly communicant and

A CHANGE OF RELIGION.

a member of the choir in the Protestant, as he had just previously been in the Catholic, chapel. I further learned from a prisoner who had been tried and convicted at the same sessions as Blank, that, instead of his having been "rigged" as a minister or gentleman previous to conviction, an "old clo' man" would not have speculated two and sixpence upon his entire outfit.

These impostors' conduct in prison is a counterpart of the game which such swindlers carry on outside. They are sufficiently conversant in Catholic, Protestant, and Presbyterian creeds to adopt either when money or free quarters can be obtained thereby. One can well picture the sensation which "a converted priest," or hitherto "spiritually benighted Papist," would create in any of those religious circles in Great Britain where the Pope and the Catholic Church are looked upon as the "Beast" and the "scarlet lady" of the Scriptures. The collection of small silver that would follow "the confessions," and the "marks of earnest repentance of the convert" who had "at last found Christ," would be readily and ungrudgingly given to, and in all meekness pocketed by, the rogue, who next week, perhaps, would select his victims from some gullible section of Catholics, who would delight in listening to an *exposé* of the characters of those who were instrumental in effecting the Reformation. A comparison being instituted between either the devil or anti-Christ and Martin Luther, would lose the pious magsman nothing on the occasion of this second collection.

The bogus divine will work the begging-letter dodge occasionally, or resort to frauds of a similar nature, but will not pick pockets, or do ordinary vulgar thieving.

LECTURE VIII

MAGSMEN (*continued*).—BOGUS NOBLEMEN.

“Sir Roger Tichborne”—The Claimant’s advent to Dartmoor Society—His Status therein—A recognised Authority on all matters—His Insubordination—Difference between his conduct and that of self-acknowledged Shamis—His knowledge of French and acquaintance with Catholic Ritual—Samples of his Political Education—Dr. Kenealy’s reference to the Claimant’s Classical Knowledge—Another explanation—Impressions made upon Prisoners—The Claimant’s explanation of the cowardly attack upon a lady witness—Charges the Jesuits with his ruin.

IF the individual who has become a historical character under the cognomen of the “Claimant” be really Arthur Orton or Thomas Castro, he stands at the very head of his profession. If not, or rather, in any case, he is “an unfortunate nobleman,” and comes naturally within this section of the classification I have made of a convict prison’s roll. Although it is no concern of these brief sketches of criminal life and character whether the Claimant be Orton, Castro, or Roger Tichborne, still, a few remarks upon his prison conduct, as observed by me during the two years he was a fellow-prisoner of mine in Dartmoor, may not be altogether out of place in passing.

I may remark, at the outset, that I have not read the great trial which resulted in his conviction as an impostor, nor am I in possession of any facts relative thereto, or particulars of the individual’s life previous to such trial, that would enable me to form a just opinion whether he is the victim of conspiring

circumstances, or, as he alleges, treachery, or a deservedly punished criminal.

His arrival in Dartmoor, after completing the usual probationary period in Millbank Penitentiary, created unusual excitement among both warders and prisoners, but particularly among the latter. "Sir Roger" soon became the lion of the place. To fall into exercising file with him on Sunday was esteemed an event to be talked of for a week afterwards by the fortunate convict, who had, for once in his life, rubbed his skirts against one of England's proud aristocracy. To settle an argument upon any topic—legal, political, or disciplinary—required but the assertion, "Sir Roger Tichborne says so," and an immediate acquiescence in the conclusiveness of the facts or opinions advanced was the consequence. In fact, "Sir Roger" soon became the recognised authority upon every matter of moment to the one thousand citizens of Dartmoor's criminal population, from the merits of the skilly to the evils of trial by jury, or from the partisanship of judges to the quality of the shin-of-beef soup; and the acquisition to that secluded and unique society of such a man was put down among the list of great events in the history of Dartmoor. He remained the standard authority upon juries, judges, money, and victims of circumstantial evidence, to the whole chorus of gossiping magsmen, until he was finally removed to another prison.

He very soon became what prison officials term "a troublesome prisoner" in Dartmoor, thereby ranking himself among the class of criminals whom I have placed in that category; and like all other convicts who offended against the rules and regulations he had to undergo the penalty of bread-and-water diet, but never for more than two, and very seldom but for one, day at a time.

As his being a troublesome prisoner is one circumstance, though a very trivial one, towards an identity between him and the "professional noblemen" with whom I have classified him,

LEAVES FROM A PRISON DIARY.

it is but just to notice another feature in his conduct which is never found in connection with that of one of the magsmen nobility. Unlike the ordinary bogus aristocrat, "Sir Roger" never "flashed his rank"—that is, when he walked or talked with other prisoners, he did not "put on airs," or adopt the patronising manners that both outside, as well as in prison, usually denote alike the *parvenu* and the impostor. He maintained his position, though, as the real "Sir Roger Tichborne" whenever brought before governor or visiting director, or when the fact might be questioned by other prisoners, and in his letters to outside friends while in Dartmoor. Whatever the man really is, victim or fraud, Tichborne or Castro, he exhibited, while under my observation, an individuality and a bearing in marked contrast to the ordinary impostors and criminals with whom he was associated.

I have been informed, that when questioned, during his trial, as to the meaning of certain French words, and particulars of some points in the Catholic faith, which the real Sir Roger, it is alleged, would be almost certain to know, that he was unable to answer correctly in either case; thereby exhibiting his ignorance of a language spoken and the ritual of a creed proessed by the legitimate Tichborne when at Stonyhurst. If this be correct, the Claimant must have acquired a knowledge both of French and the observances of the mass in the interval between his conviction in London and his arrival in Dartmoor—a brief period of nine months—as he could both converse in French and correctly follow the ceremony of the Catholic Church while in that prison. On the other hand, it is quite possible that these parts in the *rôle* that was to be played may have been studied during his nine months' sojourn in Millbank; as Catholic books of devotion and a French grammar and dictionary would be included, if desired, among his ordinary cell books, while undergoing his probation in the penitentiary. Still, it is but just to remark that few individuals are to be found among

convicts who could make such progress in the study of a language which, though it be an easy task to learn to read it, is seldom so easily mastered as to enable a student to converse freely with a Frenchman at the expiration of nine months' self-tuition. On the other hand, Sir Roger's intellectual training and extent of general knowledge, as far as could be gathered from his prison conversation, appeared to me to be far too limited for a man that was reputed to have received a good college education, and who had, in addition, travelled so much and mixed with so many men the world over, and who had also the advantage of having passed his forty-fifth year. Dr. Johnson's remark upon the law of primogeniture that its chief excellence consisted in only making one fool in a family, may, of course, apply to the foregoing observations regarding "Sir Roger's" ability; but without some such explanation it would be very difficult to account for his many deficiencies in this respect and singular observations upon ordinary English topics, supposing him to be the man he represents himself. Having accidentally heard the result of the general election of 1874, I communicated to "Roger" the triumph of the Tories and the fact of Mr. Disraeli becoming Prime Minister; whereupon he remarked, "Then you see if he does not make himself First Lord of the Treasury also." On another occasion he informed me that Dr. Kencahy had introduced a *bill* into the House of Commons the week previously regarding his ("Roger's") treatment in Dartmoor, when Dr. Kencahy had simply asked a question of the Home Secretary in reference thereto. His political knowledge appeared to be exactly on a level with that of the ordinary magsman. These trifles may explain nothing as to the real character of the individual of whom they are related, as every Englishman is not supposed to have the correct use of all the technical phrases of his country's somewhat mixed political terminology; but they are mentioned here as fair samples of the manner in which "Roger" was

in the habit of expressing himself upon such matters and topics as intelligent men will make subjects of conversational intercourse.

Dr. Kenealy is reported to have laid considerable stress upon the testimony of a Latin quotation which occurred in one of his client's letters from Dartmoor, declaring, with a deal of truth, that the Wapping butcher would not be likely to repeat lines from Horace in his epistolary productions; *ergo*, the man who did so was not Castro. The lines were—

*“Feliciter artes didicisse emollit mores
Nec sinit esse feros,”*

and form one of the most frequent stock classical quotations from the Latin poets that are to be met with, in company with their translation, throughout English literature. I have seen the same lines several times in prison library books in Dartmoor, and as the books of the prison are in constant circulation among the prisoners, it is almost certain that “Roger” would have come across one or other of the works in which I had read the lines referred to. *À propos* of this quotation, and the letter in which it was made, I was told by a very intelligent prisoner who had repeatedly conversed with “Roger,” that the letter about the classical nature of which Dr. Kenealy sought to make so much capital for his client, was written for the latter by a prisoner with whom he (“Roger”) was very intimate, and who passed himself off among his fellow-prisoners as “the heir-apparent to an earldom.” I cannot vouch for the truth of the statement that the letter containing the lines of Horace was not “Roger’s” production; and I merely relate it here as one of the many *on dits* that circulated concerning him among his fellow-prisoners while in Dartmoor.

The impression which he made upon nineteen out of every twenty prisoners with whom he was in daily contact while in Dartmoor was favourable to his claims and pretensions; but the sympathies of men who have imbibed and nourished a strong

resentment to the law that has consigned themselves to penal servitude will almost always incline them to an adverse opinion of the fairness of its decision, and carry their prejudices to the side of "the innocent victims of the law's injustice," as most criminals designate themselves. "Roger" affected the sincerest contrition for the cowardly aspersion he had cast upon the honour of one of the lady witnesses against him, expressing himself, if I remember rightly, as having been betrayed into the brutal statement "by the maze into which he had been thrown while undergoing cross-examination by Attorney-General Coleridge, who had laid such a trap for him in order to damage his case should he succeed in dragging him into it." He insisted, also, that the Jesuits had been instrumental in effecting his ruin, so as to have the bringing up of "his nephew" and the control of his property in their hands. What his demeanour has been since his removal from Dartmoor to Portsmouth Prison is, of course, unknown to me; but if it has been in keeping with what fell under my observation during a couple of years, in which he was imprisoned in the former place, he is not likely to emerge from penal servitude as a convert to the Castro-Orton theory of his enemies, or be deterred by the terrible penalty which he has undergone from asserting his claim to the name and property of Sir Roger Tichborne.

LECTURE IX.

BOGUS NOBLEMEN (*continued*).

The Aristocratic Impostor—His Qualifications—How the Oracle is Worked—Exploits of "M. le Duc de Montmethuseil," Relative of the House of Bourbon-Orleans.

THE bogus nobleman is always of good address, and shines particularly in conversation, as, I suppose, the real article does when met with in society. He affects to treat everybody, save warders, with a lofty disdain becoming his rank, while the attitude he assumes when compelled to wheel a barrow, use a shovel, or carry a slop-can, would remind one of Lord Dundreary employed in nursing the baby when apprehensive of a catastrophe. His customary talk is of high living, good society, university training, foreign travel, horses, wine, and women; invariably winding up with a resolve to leave England for ever when released, and reside abroad for the remainder of life in the enjoyment of juster laws, sunnier climes, and *recherché* pleasures. If he can avoid it, the prison nobleman will never exercise or hold any converse with an avowed pickpocket, and if compelled by accidental association to do so, he will endeavour to look as indignant and to assume as much *hauteur* as is consistent with personal safety, the professional "hooks" being ever ready to "punch the nose" of their aristocratic associate, or to designate him as "a blooming swine," in case he should venture open annoyance or insult. They partake in a great

measure of the characteristics of the begging-letter writers, already described, but carry their swindling schemes with a higher hand, and a more polished finish of execution. Respectable country hotels, the rural squirearchy, and families of rich manufacturers or of retired business men constitute the particular prey of the magsman nobility. The weakness of English national character for titled or distinguished personages is thoroughly understood by the criminal *noblesse*, and wherever moneyed people are to be found who are not of the upper ten themselves, but who dearly love a lord, a baronet, a general, or colonel, there is the opening for a sham foreign duke, count, or baron, or native professional aristocrat to introduce himself to gratify the yearnings of the aspiring circle, the longings of title-seeking parents having marriageable daughters, and the vanity of the gossips of the locality, with the sight, conversation, and familiarity of one of the class of superior mortals.

They usually work in couples, one only appearing upon the scene at a time, the other being employed, at a distance, in the task of aiding his confederate in supporting the rôle he has to play. Their qualification for this particular kind of swindle consists, generally, in having at some period of their lives followed either the occupation of a walking gentleman in some travelling theatre, the calling of footman or valet in some gentleman's service, or other occupation in which polite manners and a taste for gentlemanly attire might be acquired. With, of course, special qualifications in addition to some training like the foregoing, and equipped with paste jewellery, and "aristocratic address," the paste nobleman, general, &c., is fully rigged for his professional career.

Their plans and schemes are, of course, shaped more by favouring circumstances than by any fixed mode of procedure. A stranger will arrive, say, at some out-of-the-way country hotel, with a portmanteau or valise, bearing evidence of foreign travel in sundry labels, &c., and marked General or Colonel Somebody,

or a Sir, Lord, or other title, and will commence to make inquiries as to shooting, fishing, or other sports of the district, the names of the local gentry, and the salubrious character of the climate thereabouts. If any substantial mansion should chance to be empty in or near the district, he will take mine host into his confidence and discuss the suitability of the locality as a summer, autumn, or winter resort for himself and family. In a day or two letters and society journals will arrive at the hotel from the confederate addressed to Sir Roland, Lord Athelstone, or Colonel Montmorency, as the case might be; and the fact of that part of England or Scotland being honoured with the presence of a distinguished individual will immediately spread throughout the neighbourhood. Instead of thrusting himself upon the hospitality of some retired grocer or iron-monger with plenty of money, or other susceptible wealthy individual, the chances are ten to one that a spirit of rivalry will exhibit itself among his dupes as to who shall have the honour of running "the big nob" while sojourning in their midst. In whatever house he might stay for a few days, the letters and papers already referred to would be sure to arrive, and lend their indispensable aid in sustaining the assumed character of the distinguished or noble stranger. A particular letter, or perhaps telegram, would contain some vexatious news from his lawyer or agent, in reference to an unexpected delay in obtaining rent, quarterly dividends, &c., but promising a certain remittance in the course of a week or ten days. In this perplexity the stranger is reluctantly compelled to trouble some of his new acquaintances, &c., the farce ending in the usual manner by the distinguished visitor quite suddenly disappearing, and allowing the society which had delighted in his company, and had been enraptured with his blue-blood accomplishments, to relapse into its normal repose.

I well remember the *furor* of genteel excitement which reigned among the cotton and shoddy aristocracy of the

valley of Rossendale, Lancashire, for a few weeks in '68, as the result of the unexpected arrival in its midst of a duke, who was reputed a near relative of the royal house of Bourbon-Orleans. The lucky circumstance which directed his grace's noble footsteps towards that hitherto neglected portion of England occurred as follows: Captain M——, of the cotton-manufacturing firm of M—— Brothers, and local volunteer military fame, having some business in London in the above year, strolled one day into St. James's Park to take the air, and observing a crowd apparently jostling a gentlemanly-looking person, went to the rescue of the individual, and extricated him from the annoyance to which he appeared to be subjected. The stranger was, as in duty bound, profuse in his thanks to the gallant captain, and requested the favour of knowing to whom he was so much indebted. Cards were immediately exchanged, and upon the captain glancing at the one which was handed him by the stranger, he read thereon—

"M. LE DUC DE MONTMETHUSEIL."

An invitation to honour him with his company at dinner at his hotel was tendered by the captain, which was at once most graciously accepted by Monsieur le Duc. Another favour was humbly begged, as a consequence of the condescending manner in which the first was granted, and to the delight of the captain the near relative of Bourbon royalty consented to accompany his gallant friend down to the forest of Rossendale, there to partake of the hospitality so eagerly pressed upon him. The whole district, from the town of Bacup at the head of the valley, down to Haslingden near the entrance thereto (where I resided at the time), was thrown into a fever of curiosity and excitement in consequence of the distinction conferred upon its gentry by the presence of a live duke; and Captain M—— became the second lion of the district for having been the means of introducing the noble foreigner to its society. Parties followed

parties in honour of the duke among the circle in which the captain moved ; invitations being rather selfishly confined to the local Conservatives, owing to the captain enjoying the position of a recognised leader of that party in and around Bacup ; and the Liberal cotton upper ten of the locality were, therefore, excluded from making the acquaintance of the head of the house of Montmethuseil. Stories of the duke's astonishing condescension began to circulate among the whole population of Rossendale, and his person, remarks, and every-day doings became the subject of comment and gossip in every factory in that busy manufacturing valley.

He gratified the desire of the members of the local volunteer corps, of which his host was captain, by becoming an honorary member, and further exhibited his ducal politeness by dining with the men upon the occasion of a grand military dinner, given by the captain to celebrate the red-letter-day event in the history of the corps. At the ball which followed the duke distinguished himself by his dancing, leading off the dance with the rustic belle of the occasion in a manner that would reflect credit upon the most gallant noble of the court of his ancestor Louis Quatorze. He next granted the diffident request of another local manufacturer, and became godfather to his son, who had fortunately come into the world just in time to receive this ever-to-be-afterwards remembered distinction. Several return invitations were given by the duke to visit his chateau in Normandy in the following autumn, where, he hoped, his friends from Rossendale would enjoy the excellent shooting that was to be had in that delightful portion of la belle France.

Rumour had it that the duke was given the use of his host's cheque-book, pending the arrival of the regular monthly remittance from his Paris bankers ; and that, as became a personage of his rank and enormous possessions, he was of a most generous disposition, and possessed of refined and ex-

pensive tastes. As it is not according to the customary nature of things, or rules of society, that dukes should spend all their time with cotton manufacturers, no matter how obliging and agreeable, it happened that Monsieur le Duc was summoned away one day by news of an urgent business nature, to the great regret of all who had been honoured by his company and familiarity since his advent to their circle. With his previous invitations reiterated, and a promise to make some provision for his godson, the duke departed—not to be no more heard of, unfortunately for his Rossendale entertainers, but to soon figure in quite another character. Ugly rumours of imposture began soon to circulate, along with calculations as to what “the duke’s” patronage must have cost Captain M——, and what the amount of the sums borrowed from other obliging friends; until finally the whole Liberal section of the political world of Rossendale—the leading personages amongst which “the duke” was made to ignore while in the district—was thrown into the greatest transports upon reading in the Manchester papers of a case of bankruptcy in which “M. le Duc de Montmethuseil, representing the house of Bourbon.” figured along with his father, both of whom had failed in *a tailoring business in that city*, which had been carried on in the name of “C——n and Son.” The storm of ridicule which fell on the captain’s head, and which had to be borne by his party, kept the whole district in amusement for months after the awful *exposé*; and during the election contest in North-East Lancashire, which followed the dissolution of Parliament in 1868, the Tories in Rossendale district lost the services of Captain M——, as it was impossible for him to appear in public without hearing himself shouted after as “Duke, Duke!” He, however, made a clean breast of the whole affair in a letter to one of the local papers, and accepted the entire blame attaching to the introduction of the “duke” into the society of the locality; merely adding, as a kind of return fire to the fun-poking artillery of his Liberal opponents,

that the "duke," while in London, had taken in some prominent members of the Liberal party.

Although thirteen years have gone by since the foregoing swindle was perpetrated, its memory is still alive in Rossendale, and will live as long as party strife delights in exposing the weakness or ridiculous occurrences in the character or history of political adversaries.

LECTURE X.

CLASS III. MAGSMEN (*continued*).

Aristocratic Impostures (*continued*)—Their Select Party in Dartmoor—Adventures of Bertrand Ashley, *alias* Count von Ostrogg, von Sobriski, &c.

DARTMOOR contained several of this class of impostor during the first three years of my time in that prison. Most of them had succeeded in obtaining admission to the stocking-knitting party, which, in consequence, became known among the rest of the prisoners as “the upper-ten push.” This branch of convict work, employing from a dozen to twenty prisoners, was carried on under a large shed in one of the prison yards, in conjunction with another class of light labour, namely, stone-breaking; and as this latter more democratic employment was that at which I was employed for a time, I was in a position where I could observe the conduct of the “nobility,” and note such traits of their character, tone of conversation, and general demeanour as the circumstances of the situation might call into play.⁴

The stocking party numbered among its members a Russian “count,” an English “major-general,” a “colonel,” a “captain,” the “heir-apparent to an earldom” already alluded to, and other distinguished individuals claiming somewhat less exalted positions in the world of importance and fame. The colonel was the only *bonâ fide* aristocrat in the crowd. He had been at one period of his life the governor of an island under the British Crown, and owed his imprisonment to some offence or other the

nature of which I could never rightly learn. He was an exceedingly polite and genial sort of person, and merits no further comment in connection with the impostors who formed his labour associates.

Nothing could be more laughter-provoking to any one capable of finding food for amusement in the eccentricities of human character than the studied deportment and conversation of these exquisite shams. A company of old maids emulous to appear younger than appearances would warrant could not exhibit more ridiculous expressions of face or of carriage than were presented by this assortment of precious rascals in their efforts to equal or outdo the colonel in the manner of bearing which sat quite natural upon his whole personal conduct. If one could only "wreak his feelings upon expression" while observing and listening to that select society, it would be an easy matter to set in motion the risible propensity of the most austere physiognomy. The heir-apparent to the British Crown was simply "Wales," in the "I-know-the-prince-well-you-know" style of speech affected by the "heir apparent" to the bogus earldom, while the "major-general" adopted a corresponding familiarity of expression in all matters relating to the military ranks, from the Duke of Cambridge down to sarcastic commentaries upon volunteer sham fights.

The Russian "count," however, was the personage who claimed most of my attention, not particularly on account of his distinguished rank, but from the fact that he was really of Russian birth, though imprisoned under the name of "Bertrand Victor A——." As he presents a fair sample of the "foreign-nobleman" class of impostor, already partly sketched in the episode of M. le Duc de Montmethuseil, I will finish my description of this type of criminal with a brief account of Bertrand Victor, and some of his subsequent adventures. He was a man of about thirty-five years of age, close upon six feet in height, and of very good address, the features presenting

very slight trace of his Slavonic origin; while his manners, like those of most foreigners, were gentlemanly and agreeable, particularly when he was desirous of making a good impression. His introduction to me was brought about by the fact that "the upper-ten" stocking party and that in which I was employed exercised together for half-an-hour each evening after labour; and as talking was permitted (at that time) while prisoners were exercising, there was ample opportunity for listening to adventures, and forming opinions of the prisoners with whom I was thus brought into contact. In my first chat with Bertrand Victor I learned that he was the son of a distinguished Russian; that he had been sent to England to complete his education; had studied for some time at Oxford University; had afterwards joined the English navy as surgeon, and had managed, somehow or other, not explained, to find himself at that period (1872) within two years of completing a sentence of seven in penal servitude. His English prison name was, of course, an assumed one, and his family were kept in complete ignorance of his being an inmate of an English convict establishment.

He had made a tour of Europe, saving a visit to Ireland; and, as he would be in possession of a fair fortune when again at liberty, and would be most anxious to withdraw from English society for a year or so after liberation, he was thinking of selecting that interesting country for a twelve months' sojourn when restored to freedom. "Where would he be likely to meet with polite and intellectual society out of Dublin; he having heard that that was principally an English-peopled city?" My reply being neither satisfactory nor complimentary to this proffer of distinguished patronage of Ireland, Bertrand Victor was suddenly reminded, from conversations he had had with other Fenian prisoners while in Portland Prison, that the Irish must be intellectually inferior to the English, exceptions existing, of course, in Irishmen who had won imperishable fame in the walks of English literature, &c. This is a summary of our conversation,

or rather, of his talk to me on the occasion of our first introduction. His command of languages was really marvellous, amply sustaining the well-known linguistic fame of his countrymen. His English was next to faultless in pronunciation, and he could converse with equal facility in French, German, and Italian, while he had also a reputed knowledge of Danish, Swedish, and Polish, with, of course, the perfect use of the Russian. In addition, he was as well read in English literature, and as well versed in the etiquette of English society, as an ordinary college-educated Englishman. He was, on the whole, about the most singular and the most accomplished individual with whom I conversed during my imprisonment in Dartmoor. In 1873 he was transferred from that prison to Chatham along with a batch of other convicts, from which place he was discharged in the beginning of the following year; his whole sentence of seven years having then expired.

Early in the summer of 1874 a student of E—— College engaged as foreign tutor one Count Sobriski, a Polish nobleman, who, like many more of his countrymen, had been exiled on account of his efforts to free that ill-fated land from Russian vassalage. His extraordinary linguistic accomplishments, engaging address, and distinguished birth, rendered the count an important addition to the social circle round E—— College. Among the families to which the count had obtained an introduction, through his pupil, was one which consisted of a wealthy gentleman and only daughter, the latter the heiress of her father's possessions. The lady's beauty fascinated the gallant count from the first sight of her lovely person, while the *distingué* bearing, wonderful conversational abilities, and, above all, the noble rank of the exiled Pole, made no less an agreeable impression upon the susceptibilities of the lady's heart. This mutual appreciation soon begat a declaration of love from the count, which proved both acceptable to the fair one and agreeable to papa, who was, naturally enough, pleased at the prospect

of having his daughter so married that she could figure as a countess in the ranks of society. The count was, therefore, the recognised lover of the heiress. After a wooing as short as it was successful, the count, as was pardonable under the circumstances, was most eager to crown his happiness with the right of a husband. Like all love-smitten adorers, he pressed for an early marriage-day, and had his prayer granted in the appointment of an approximate date upon which to lead the bride to the altar. But, alas! how oft has cruel accident marred the plans of Hymen, and thwarted the love aspirations of enamoured swain and languishing beauty! Why, when the course of true affection *does* run smooth, will the tyrant of romantic love appear on the scene, in some form or other, and snap in twain the flowery links that are to bind two hearts for ever?

The young lady became unwell. The doctor prescribed Margate for a fortnight, and the count was pressed to accompany his darling and her papa to that (unfortunately for the count) largely frequented resort. The day after the arrival of the party the lovers were strolling along the beach, the count in all likelihood adopting the words of Claude Melnotte, and picturing to the raptured fancy of his Pauline some romantic castle by the waters of a Polish Como, where they would dwell in conjugal happiness, and laugh to scorn the impotency of descriptive genius to paint in poetic words a love like theirs, when—Good gracious! What has happened? The count has stopped, as if struck with a bullet, declares, watch in hand, that an appointment of a most vital family nature *must* be kept in London that very afternoon, and thereupon dashes off to the railway station like a shot.

A few moments after, when the young lady and her papa were recovering somewhat from the surprise into which the count's singular behaviour had thrown them, two men who had been following the movements of the party on the beach approached, and, after saluting the lady, informed them that the individual

whom they had just seen in the company of the gentleman and his daughter was a recently-released convict and most accomplished impostor! Some swooning followed, of course, the fainting lady was driven to an hotel, a doctor was summoned, and *thus ended the dream of the would-be countess*; and with her and her ambitious papa my story has nothing further to do. But to follow the flight of the amorous Sobriski. During the count's sojourn in E—— it transpired that certain property in jewellery, money, and plate belonging to his pupil and the latter's friends became missing, some of which was discovered in the count's apartments during his love trip to Margate. It was for this he was "wanted" by the emissaries of the law. After his escape from Margate he was traced to a west-end lodging-house, was surprised, but not captured, in the middle of the night, and had to make his way over the roof in anything but full dress. He succeeded in eluding the efforts of his pursuers for some weeks after this narrow escape, but finally succumbed to a stratagem on the part of the detectives who were at the time acquainted with the locality where he was in hiding. A paragraph was made to appear in a London daily, containing, as a piece of apparently authentic intelligence, the information of Count Sobriski's having baffled the vigilance of Scotland Yard, and succeeded in making his escape to Belgium. Thrown off his guard upon reading this paragraph, and believing his pursuers to have followed a wrong scent, the count emerged from his hiding-place and took himself to Burton-on-Trent, there to engage in any enterprise which fortune might kindly place in his way. There was but time for the intelligence to spread in the neighbourhood of his hotel that a Swedish nobleman of great accomplishments and fortune, one Count von Ostrogg, was staying there, before the London detectives appeared on the scene, captured their man, and terminated his swindling career for the second time in England. His trial disclosed most of the foregoing and other facts concerning successful frauds since being

liberated from Chatham some six or eight months previously, and the judge awarded the unfortunate "count" a sentence of fifteen years' penal servitude. Among the many "old familiar faces" that met my view upon attending service in the Catholic chapel in this prison the first Sunday of my arrival here in February last, was that of "Bertrand Victor A——," *alias* "Count Sobriski," a convict this time in the name of von Ostrogg. I was informed by a French thief while in Dartmoor that the "Russian," as he was familiarly termed, had completed two terms of imprisonment on the continent before coming to England—one in the prison of Königsberg, and the other in Moulins, near Paris.

Allowing five years for both of these terms, in the absence of the correct sentences, the "count," upon the termination of his present "lagging," will have undergone seven-and-twenty years of imprisonment—a terrible penalty, in all faith, to pay for the life of an accomplished rogue, offering very little inducement to mortals who aspire to be considered of noble birth and station to leave the paths of honest labour, and the safer, if less sensational, position of ordinary citizenship.

The remaining types of criminal belonging to the order of magsmen do not call for any specific description—such as medical quacks, and other mock professors who are seldom introduced into convict society, being more acquainted with county prisons and city bridewells in short sentences of one or two years.

The magsman is the most intellectual of society's professional criminals, and not the least singular feature in the character of these swindlers is the possession, by a very large portion of them, of unusual talents, great fertility of resource, and thorough knowledge both of human nature and of the world, which, if but joined to an observance of moral precept in some business or professional pursuit, would enable them to fulfil a share of the functions of social life with success

to themselves and no small benefit to civilised society. It is a deplorable fact, but nevertheless true, that not two per cent. of this class ever abandon their dishonest pursuits until the diseases contracted in the indulgence of immoral habits, and the wear and tear of penal servitude, commit them, in comparatively early life, to the custody of the grim jailer Death, never more to prey upon the property or play upon the weakness of their species.

LECTURE XI.

CLASS III. SECTION 2. "HOOKS."

General Characteristics—Difference between Hooks and "Snatchers"—Influences which Nourish the Pickpocket Class—Professional Pride—The Cadger-Thief Repudiated—"The Man of the World"—His Accomplishments—Lady Hooks—How they Work—The Scientific Method of Pocket-picking—The various Dodges of the Hook.

HOOKS.—These individuals, who are also known as "gunns" and "buzzers," in prison slang, constitute the pickpocket class in its various specialties. They can be subdivided into three orders: "men of the world," or professional hooks; ordinary "snatchers," or young and inexperienced thieves; and "thief-cadgers," the lowest species of the class. While distinct in their manner of thieving, these three sections of the great pickpocket order, excepting, to some extent, the first, have their "professional calling" so well outlined in gait, constant use of slang, furtive looks, almost total want of tact in their ordinary conduct, with an instinctively suspicious manner in almost all their actions, that they are as easily distinguishable from the other criminals of a prison as they are recognisable to their constant pursuers, the police, when abroad in the world. Nineteen out of every twenty of this whole order will have served one or more terms of imprisonment in county jails, previous to an *entrée* into penal servitude; while thirty per cent. will be re-convicted convicts, having a "lagging" or two scored against them in penal records. They are among the most troublesome men in a prison, and will steal anything upon which they can lay their

fingers, from another prisoner's bread to any article belonging to the place which can be taken in spite of warder's vigilance. They can no more resist the temptation to lay hands upon anything of value that may chance to lie in their way, than can a cat forbear to seize a mouse which runs across its path. Thieving with these unfortunate beings seems to be a kind of instinct, the incessant promptings of which is beyond the power of their stunted mental and moral faculties to withstand, and the complete subduing or even temporary subjection of whose workings neither punishment nor kindness, teaching nor threatening, can in the least degree effect. Give one of them three days' bread-and-water diet for going into another prisoner's cell and stealing his bread, and he will commit a similar theft the hour after the termination of that punishment, if he thinks he has a chance of not being caught in the act. Throw a tempting lady's pocket, or a carelessly hanging watch-chain in the way of a "hook" the week following his liberation from a seven years' imprisonment, and he will forget everything he has suffered, and all that may happen again, in an effort to possess himself of what appeals to this predominant instinct of his perverted being. The removing of an habitual pickpocket from among the public by a sentence of penal servitude under the existing system is simply deterring him for that period from troubling society, and will have as much effect upon his conduct when he finds his way into the world again as the pruning of a garden shrub would have upon its growth.

Of all the social desperadoes that belong to the present civilised order of things, this class is, *par excellence*, society's special contribution to its own punishment. Bred in the slums of London, Manchester, Liverpool, Glasgow, Birmingham, Dublin, or other large city, of low, and invariably drunken parents, often the offspring of unfortunate women; sent out thieving when but eight or nine years old by mothers who are little better than prostitutes; what wonder that these wretched

creatures should grow up as ignorant of right and as prone to snatch at whatever comes within their reach as the less depraved, irrational animals, which but follow a law of their nature in seizing upon anything that excites their craving? Would society rid itself of this social pest, or rather, would it emasculate the agencies which nourish the infancy and train the maturity of this particular class of criminal, let the offspring of crime and pauperism be taken as young as possible from the atmosphere of vice or degrading squalor in which they are to be found, and be removed to kindergarten schools, entirely away from parents who will only rear them for a similar pursuit to their own. Let the state demolish what remains of city slums. Let every low drink house be swept away, and let society apply itself in solemn earnest to provide not only better houses for the poor, but opportunities for more elevating recreation, and then, and not till then, will the low pickpocket and the bruiser type of ruffian begin to be improved off the face of civilised life.

Taking the pickpocket class in the order in which I have arranged its several sections, the "man of the world" comes up for first description. He is the professional or skilled rifler of other people's pockets, and differs in many respects from his less experienced, and of course less exalted, brethren, the common "snatcher" and the "cadger." Of the latter he holds the smallest possible opinion, and, like the "honourable thief" of the burglar class, looks upon him as a disgrace to the accomplished order of theft, and seldom associates with him when out of prison. I one day received some abusive language from one of this most despised class of criminal, and I excited the curiosity of a "hook" in the party as to why I did not "hit the blooming cadger a punch on the nose?" My reply being that I could take no offence at anything a thief might say, the hook promptly corrected me by exclaiming, "You think *him* a thief? He never was anything of the sort in his blooming life. He is a blooming *cadger*!" Had I called a Dublin policeman

a senior Fellow of Trinity College within the hearing of one of its students, my statement could not have been more emphatically or indignantly repudiated.

The "man of the world," as he loves to style himself, is so called, not from any resemblance to the similarly designated personage of polite society, but from the fact of his accomplishment being such that he can follow his profession anywhere—in the streets, riding in busses or railway trains, or wherever in London or the provinces inclination or business may direct his course. He is generally "an old hand," that is, over twenty-five years of age, and a confirmed gaol-bird. He will turn his talents to any other job in the way of thieving that may turn up in his travels "around the world," from robbing a hen roost in a country place to an attempt at burglary where he believes there are no city policemen to spoil his game. In London and other large cities he is generally in co. with a "lady hook," or a "pal" of his own sex and particular walk.

The lady, as is usually the case when criminally educated or inclined, is the cleverer artist in the calling she pursues, and is very often the only active worker of such a partnership, especially when working along with a hook who has been three or four times "lagged" for having allowed himself to be caught.

The "lady" is always provided with a dress having long and wide sleeves, within which she can move her hand and "hooks" (fingers) easily when standing or sitting close to the individual whose pocket she is anxious to explore. The gentleman is also provided either with a similarly furnished coat, or he carries a light overall, rug, or shawl upon his arm, so as to disguise as far as possible the working of the operating member while rifling a slum. Some pockets are, of course, more readily got into than Dublin, or all individuals are not good game in this particular parents, often the ones. Hooks, male or female, seldom exercise thieving when but eight wrapped or wide-awake looking person—little better than prostitu: picked in a bus, railway car, or where a

number of people are sitting or standing close together, the theft may be performed by the hand nearest the party who is to be robbed—the cloak or other article of dress which will be carelessly thrown over such hand being made to hide what is going on underneath—while the operator is chatting with his prey or otherwise diverting attention from his efforts to obtain purse or money. But the off hand, or that farthest from the side of the victim, is more frequently the extracting medium. Assuming a gentleman to be about having his watch stolen by a clever pick-pocket, while standing in a street, or looking into a window, the operation would be performed, other circumstances favouring the thief, as follows. The hook would introduce himself by asking the gentleman's opinion as to the worth of a ring, scarf-pin, or other such article which he, the speaker, had just purchased cheap in the belief that the ring was really gold, or that the pin contained a diamond. The article upon which the gentleman's judgment was to be pronounced would be given to him by that one of the thief's hands which would be next to the person of the gentleman, and which would be carrying the cloak or overall already referred to while the other hand would be moved horizontally, and from the elbow only, across the thief's breast, and under cover of the cloak or coat, towards the watch-pocket of the victim. The essential point in the performance is to divert the victim's attention as much as possible from the neighbourhood of his watch, and for the performer to speak and act as if the operating hand belonged to a third party which could be neither seen nor felt by the victim. If the watch is fastened to its chain by a bar, it is deftly broken off (“breaking off a jerry”) by the thief's fingers; but if by a swivel, it must either be put back into the owner's pocket, allowed to hang by its chain and so expose the nature of the whole transaction, or be snatched, and the after proceedings made a run on the part of the hook, and a cry of “Stop thief!” on that of the owner of the watch. The necessary introduction to the successful

perpetration of the robbery may be effected in a score of other ways beside the one described ; such as asking information as to the whereabouts of a certain locality, requesting the favour of having a slip of paper read containing an address or other writing which the stranger cannot read ; offering of flowers, books, &c., for sale, and desiring their inspection. In all such instances, however, the thief is certain to be carrying some loose article of dress or convenient parcel upon one arm, without the aid of which it would be well-nigh impossible to "break off a jerry," scientifically or in daylight, without instant detection.

The "lady hook" frequently carries a small pair of very sharp and peculiarly formed shears, with which she very often cuts her way into a stubborn or well-concealed pocket belonging to members of her own sex, while the male artist occasionally employs a lancet-like penknife for the purpose of cutting out the breast-pocket of a buttoned-up coat, which he believes may contain a pocket-book or other property.

This, the clever type of pickpocket, is generally pretty well dressed, is possessed of a fair amount of intelligence, and frequents places of public resort, theatres, churches, races, &c. One who was an admitted adept in this branch of crime, and from whom I have obtained most of my information upon the "art" of thieving, told me that he had taken more than one purse and watch out of the British Museum, "where," he remarked, "it was quite easy to fix the attention of the victim by pointing out the excellences of a picture or statue with one hand while 'hooking' with the other." He never went to "business" without furnishing himself with the indispensable cloak or wrap for the arm, the use for which I have previously described.

LECTURE XII.

CLASS III. HOOKS (*continued*).

“Chucking a Dummy”—How Places of Worship are occasionally “Surprised”—“Snatchers” constitute the Youth of a Prison—How “Brought Out”—Their Places of Resort—The Pestilent Influence of the Literature of Rascaldom—How Honest Boys are Made Thieves—The Thief-Cadger—His Schemes.

I WAS startled while at work one day in Dartmoor by seeing the hook who was last described leap off the seat next mine, in a shed where our party was stone-breaking, as if he had been cast by a giant into the middle of the place, there fall upon his back, and go through the most horrible writhings I had ever witnessed. His eyes appeared as if bursting from their sockets, blood and foam oozed from his mouth, while four other prisoners could scarcely hold his arms, so fearfully was his whole body convulsed, forming altogether one of the most sickening sights I had ever beheld. After three or four minutes’ apparent agony he quieted down, and was carried off to the infirmary. Being an exceedingly intelligent young fellow, I could not help expressing to the warder what a pity it was that one so full of life and health should be afflicted with so terrible a malady as fits; whereupon he simply gave me for reply a look which, if capable of being put into action, would bode no good to the back of the prisoner just removed to the hospital as an afflicted wretch apparently deserving of the commiseration of any man possessing the feelings of ordinary humanity. “Yes, it *is* a pity,” he answered at last, and strode away, as if leaving unuttered,

"that the doctor will not report him to the director for a flogging!"

Only a few days elapsed, after this incident, until I found myself almost of the same opinion. The object of my pity returned to his work after three days' hospital treatment, and I took the first opportunity that offered to fall in file with him at evening exercise, to learn how he became subject to such an affliction. I was thunderstruck at the reply which he made to my inquiry—"I never had a real fit in all my life. What you saw the other day was what we call 'chucking a dummy,' or, as you might name it, in your less expressive manner of speaking, 'counterfeiting a fit.' We sometimes," continued he, "make good use of this dodge when a number of us go to 'do' a chapel, or meeting-place of would-be pious individuals. In the most appropriate part of the proceedings one of us 'chucks a dummy.' There is, of course, an immense sensation created in the audience—women come with their scent-bottles, men rush for water, great sympathy is expressed by others; while the hooks are all the time busy at the pockets of the pitying crowd and easing them of their purses. Half-a-dozen of us have taken upwards of fifty pounds out of a congregation on one Sunday evening by means of this trick."

"But do you not consider you are making it bad for those poor wretches who really are so afflicted by doing that revolting action here?" I ventured to object.

"Well, as to that," he answered, "you might as well plead on behalf of those who lose their purses. I chucked that one the other day in order to get removed from the cell I was then in, which was next to that of a blooming swine whom I did not like; and I had no other excuse with which to go to the infirmary until my cell would be filled by some one else, so that I should be located elsewhere."

He also informed me that the same horrible trick is often performed in the open street, in a public-house, or other such

place, where it would be likely to gather a crowd for confederate thieves to operate upon.

After undergoing two or three sentences of penal servitude, the hooks employ, or rather train, young boys in the tricks for which they have been so deservedly punished themselves, and they seldom venture again upon the work of any job that is not deemed perfectly safe of accomplishment. In consequence of this they are about the worst type of criminal against which society has to defend itself. Their reformation is as hopeless as would be the efforts to wash a negro white. They make the most frequent use of slang of all thieves, and have a cypher language by which they can converse with each other without being understood by the uninitiated.

Snatchers.—This type of pickpocket bears the same resemblance to his superior brother, the hook, as the apprentice to some trade does to his master in the matter of proficiency. The average age of prisoners of this branch who are found in a convict establishment will not be more than twenty. They constitute the youth of a prison, and their one great ambition is to be thought clever enough to have performed some daring or successful theft after having been "brought out" by some renowned hook. They will almost all be found to have had drunken and semi-prostitute mothers, who will have sent them a-thieving when quite young, and to have undergone some years' confinement in "the school," as they term the reformatory. They are always taken in hand by the old "faikes" (old experienced criminals), trained in all the ways of theft, and fixed for life in a circle of reproductive crime, between careers of thieving and drunkenness, when at liberty, and alternate terms of imprisonment as convicted felons. Numbers of them are also in keeping of prostitutes, by whom they are enticed into or made to follow the thieving profession. Their most frequent mode of theft is simply to snatch at a watch-chain, and trust to darkness and fleetness of foot for an escape with chain and

watch. They also steal in this manner from ladies any article of value which they observe being carried in a careless manner. Lord Mayor's Day in London is their grand harvest time, but a harvest time for the detectives in their capture also. They very often move in gangs, surrounding a man who may be "sporting a red jerry" (a "loud" exhibition of gold guard), and snatch his watch amid the jostling. They are also very busy at Epsom during race time, and ply their game as well at public gatherings, Hyde Park meetings, street-corner preaching, &c. Owing to their youth they are more susceptible to the reforming efforts of priest and chaplain than any other section of a prison, country offenders excepted. Very few, however, are ever permanently rescued from the life with which they were made acquainted when young, owing chiefly to their early training in dishonesty, and from invariably falling again into the hands of old thieves or abandoned women after being discharged from prison. The frequent re-convictions of these young thieves is, in nineteen cases out of twenty, the immediate consequence of these two most fruitful of all the agencies of criminal pursuit. They are quite as troublesome in prison as the hook, and with him swell the record of extra punishments in the convict establishments. They are generally of a poor physique, being debilitated through the various diseases that result from neglected childhood, unwholesome food, and the venereal scourges so prevalent amongst the criminal classes generally. While possessing a deal of low cunning, together with a moderate intelligence chiefly acquired in reformatories and county prisons, they are the most ignorant of the thieving class, saving the country thieves and cadgers, exhibiting in all matters beyond their vicious pursuits an animal-like stupidity and want of judgment and tact, which place them intellectually lower than even the country thief, who can scarcely read or write.

Among this class of young thieves are often found youths who have had honest parents and a proper bringing up, and who are

exceptions to the foregoing remarks on the physical inferiority and ignorance of the generality of snatchers. These are the victims of such works as *Blueskin*, *Three-finger Jack*, *Jack Sheppard*, *Claud Duval*, *Dick Turpin*, and the various other pestiferous criminal novelettes which have obtained such an immense circulation among boys of the industrial classes of these countries during the past twenty years. The writers of these thief-making sheets represent their pickpocket, burglar, or highwayman hero in picturesque colours, and surround their adventures, in attacks on police and robbery of victims, with such descriptions of daring exploits, stirring incidents, hair-breadth escapes, and gallantry towards the fair sex, that the real immediate nature of their pursuits becomes divested of its inherent wrong, and presents to the young and inexperienced mind nothing but a course of romantic adventure, to emulate which is more chivalrous than censurable, and to surpass in daring but the high-road to boyish conception of fame. Hundreds of bright intelligent boys have been torn from the homes of respectable parents through the instrumentality of this literature of rascaldom, and have become cast, in most cases, for their whole future among the felon ranks of habitual criminal life. Others, of a similar honest rearing, have fallen into habits of crime from association with abandoned women, by whom they are sent upon thieving errands, "in order to show their pluck and the stuff they are made of," but in reality to obtain money or anything else that will provide these wretched beings with drink and pleasure.

Thief-Cadgers.—This, the pariah order of habitual criminal, is designated "the cadger" from uniting two callings in his mode of thieving—begging (cadging) and "shop-lifting." They usually assume the poverty-stricken or hard-up looks of the common mendicant, and ply their real pursuit under cover of a disguise that is calculated to arouse pity for their seemingly wretched lot, rather than suspicion of their intentions. Mostly

all the theft known as shop-lifting (stealing articles exhibited for sale in or around shops), so frequently committed in large cities, is performed by this type of thief. He will beg from house to house in town or country, and "bone" anything of value which he may find unwatched or otherwise unprotected in his way. If he finds a house at which he calls for alms empty—that is, if the owners or persons in charge are absent for a short time, or employed in another part of the house—the thief-cadger will help himself to whatever is worth "boying" and of easy removal, and is off and away with limb as nimble and eye as quick as these organs were probably made to appear the reverse a few minutes previously. They also, in London particularly, lie in wait for children running errands, and rob them of whatever they may be carrying at the time. When on the thieving path, both in cities and large towns, they provide themselves with slips of paper containing an address, which, if surprised in a house or shop ere commencing to steal, they will produce, and ask whoever chances to appear on the scene to be so kind as to read it for them, as they (the cadgers) are no "scholarads." "Set a thief to catch a thief" is referable to this and are; as they are generally the informers of their own class, successful wōl a rule, the means of betraying to the police the more skilful brethren of a burglary or other job performed by their ready to "put away" (in crime. In prison they are always have anything contraband upon) any other prisoner who may consequence of these qu and on his person or in his cell. In prisoners with contempt, alities they are treated by almost all convicts, who look upon and are often savagely beaten by other the warders for spying x them as instruments in the hands of the lowest and most re upon other prisoners. They are about with anywhere. Th pulsive species of human being to be met prison, where they ey spend most of their miserable lives in their lot outside. Enjoy a better scale of living than falls to When living for a short time in liberty, that

is, between two sentences, they sleep in out-houses, the parks, eabs, under arches, and other such places. Their prowling in the guise of beggars subjects the real mendicant, the broken-down workman or victim of misfortune who dreads the stigma of workhouse pauperism, to unjust and unmerited suspicion, which often makes it difficult for these poor creatures to obtain a crust outside of the institution which they dread to enter.

LECTURE XIII.

CLASS IV.

THE "BRUISER": His Photo—What other Criminals think of him—His Accomplishments—How he Works his Game—His Attacks on Warders.

THE "BOUNCE": The "Injured Husband" Trick—The Lady Accomplice—The Class from which Victims are Selected—How the Black-Mail is Levied—Extent to which this Game is carried on.

THE "COMMON BOUNCE": Infamous Nature of this Crime.

THE BRUISER.—This, the fourth and last class into which I have divided the inmates of a convict prison, is the least numerous of the four; but, as if in recompense for that, is the most dangerous of them all. I have already observed that the bruiser is the nearest approach to Dickens's hero Bill Sykes, so far as the criminal in the flesh can well correspond to that of the novelist. Murderers are never, however, found in this class in prison. This is opposed to the popular opinion, which believes that classification of offence more or less defines classification of prison conduct also. But I have shown in my remarks upon Class I. that the convicts who have imbrued their hands in the blood of their fellow-men are among the most docile prisoners and the most amenable to prison discipline. Neither does the bruiser class necessarily include all those who rob with violence, though numbers of that desperate order are of course found in its ranks.

The bruiser is a peculiar and composite criminal, made up of the meanness and non-professional traits of a cadger and the pretensions of a pugilist, together with the cowardice of a street-corner bully joined to all the reputed accomplishments of Bill

Sykes, saving that gentleman's proneness to commit murder. He is as clumsy at the commission of a theft as would be a ploughman in the repairing of a watch, and is never credited by the other thieves with the possession of either smartness, ability, fame, or "honour." He is the very embodiment of idleness inside of prison as he doubtless is outside, and to this fact, together with the thoroughly communistic regulation of the convict commonwealth, that those who will not work must pay for their laziness in the matter of diet, is due the greater portion of the bruiser's violence in prison, for which he receives additional and merited punishment. His prison talk is generally of all the people he has "slugged" (beaten), from "coppers" (police-men) to reputed pugilists, or men otherwise renowned for their fistic prowess. He is, in consequence of this talk, spoken of derisively by his prison companions as "a bloke who has a private churchyard of his own outside where he buries all whose lights he puts out." He will not unfrequently "turn over" another thief—that is, rob a pickpocket or other such artist of the "swag," which the latter may have "boned" by his skill. His chief support, however, is his "old woman," as he always terms the unfortunate creature who co-habits with him, and whom he frequently ill-uses in the most brutal and cowardly manner; and in addition to compelling her to procure him money in the ordinary manner in which such creatures earn it, he very often resorts to a method which bears some resemblance to the crimes next to be described, namely, "carrying the kosh" (bludgeon). Armed with this weapon, which he carries in his sleeve, he keeps in sight of his "old woman" for "protection," and upon any one engaging the latter in conversation in the parks or unfrequented places, rushes to the rescue of his "wife or sister," and offers the person thus caught the alternative of being punched into mince-meat in no time, or the forking out of all the loose cash he may have upon his person. As the latter demand is not generally very pleasing to the character of

men on whom the attempts are made, desperate fights are of frequent occurrence, in which the policeman occasionally figures, when, in consequence, the offence becomes known as robbery with violence. He will never represent himself as having been "lagged" for anything else but "slugging a copper"—a deed always highly applauded in convict society, and for very obvious reasons. On the whole the bruiser is the most brutal and criminal-like in appearance of all convicts, and takes rank with the lowest of those already described in ignorance, and all the repulsive features of avowed and unconscionable crime. His attacks upon prison warders are more frequently prompted by a repugnance to labour than from any innate love of thrashing somebody. An offence of this kind is put back by the governor for the adjudication of the visiting director, who comes to a convict prison for such among other purposes once every month or six weeks, and until the offender is thus dealt with he is confined in separate cells and exempt from labour. It is but the most stupid of lazy brutes who would act in this manner, as an attack upon a warder is always met by a defence in which the bruiser receives more than he bargains for, together with the additional punishment of the cat, which is awarded him by the visiting director. To finish the picture of this ugly jail-bird, I have been informed that numbers of his class go through the performance already described, employing their sisters as the necessary female confederate.

The Bouncer.—The class of crime represented by this, the slang name of its professors, seldom or never figures in a criminal prosecution, although it is of the commonest occurrence in most large cities, especially in London, and is the means of extracting large sums of money from many gentlemen in society who would be proof against any other species of robbery or fraud. It is very difficult to describe what it exactly means, or the agencies employed in entrapping its victims; but I will endeavour to give an outline of it as far as decency of expression will permit.

It is divided into two branches—"the injured husband" and "the common bouncer." In carrying out the robbery by the former trick, "a lady" is indispensable, and she is, of course, either of the class of unfortunates, or one of the very numerous women who co-habit with professional thieves, and who pursue thieving likewise, but who are not of the ordinary abandoned following. Her male confederate is sure to be an old jail-bird, or thief-trainer, who has fallen back upon this class of crime after having served two or three sentences of penal servitude; for the reason that the police seldom catch, and victims dare not prosecute, those who perpetrate it. The manner of working the "injured husband" dodge is as follows. The lady, provided with a moderate share of good looks, and well dressed, lies in wait for some elderly, well-to-do gentleman who has been previously fixed upon as a victim by her "husband" (the jail-bird in question), or occasionally one who may not have been thus selected; and by arts known to that class of women induce the victim to accompany her to her home or lodgings, she invariably representing herself as being a servant or seamstress out of employment, and of respectable character. If the ruse succeeds, the victim is decoyed to some place known for this class of crime alone, and not to an ordinary brothel, and is closely and secretly followed by the vigilant "husband." No sooner has the victim found himself *tête-à-tête* with his betrayer, than the door is burst open, and in rushes the "husband" in the wildest state of excitement, brandishing either a knife, bludgeon, or pistol, and shouting that he has seen his wife enter that house with another man, and declaring that he will take her life or that of her paramour. The "fix" of the victim can be better imagined than described. The wife falls on her knees before the infuriated "husband" and goes through the performance of endeavouring to soften his resentment against the victim, but is, of course, spurned by her wronged and virtuous spouse. Finally the "husband" summons

the owner of the house and demands the presence of a police man, in order that he may have justice at the hands of the law, and secure the exposure of the old scoundrel who has ruined his happiness for life, and covered his honest name with disgrace, &c., &c. This threat of exposure and the acting by which it is accompanied, has the desired effect upon the victim, who, of course, would part probably with half his wealth rather than his family, his friends, or the public should believe him capable of such conduct. The weeping "false one" is removed from the apartment and a bargain struck between the somewhat appeased "husband" and the "betrayer"—seldom less than a loss of all the money in the immediate possession of the entrapped party, with a written promise of more if he be known to be a man of wealth and position. The game seldom ends with the capture thus described, especially if the victim is prominently known in the locality or in society. A system of black-mailing is carried on, perhaps for years after, by which the individual who has allowed himself to fall into such a snare is compelled, under threats of public exposure, or a visit to his wife and family, to pay hundreds of pounds. Scores of such victims are moving about in society at the present hour with this penalty held over them by some successful bouncer or other, for having been guilty of a momentary indiscretion. One who had repeatedly acted the part of an "injured husband," and who was for a time in a party in which I was employed in Dartmoor, has supplied me with the foregoing particulars of this trick, which he called "playing upon the vices of rich old rascals." I was further assured by him, that he, on one occasion, compelled one of his victims to procure him an invitation to a Mansion House banquet under a threat of the above kind. He further gave me the name of a once prominent M.P., now dead, who had been successfully black-mailed by himself and his "gal" during a period of five years; for having once succumbed to this dodge. Whether this after-shadowing of a person who has

been fooled in this way be considered a merited retribution for his folly or not, is beside the question ; but the number of aged and highly respectable men in wealthy and professional circles who are under this punishment, in London alone, would astonish society if it could be accurately ascertained. It would, of course, be ridiculous to dream of putting men on their guard against this species of robbery, as no one in his senses would admit himself capable of being betrayed into such a position ; but the exhibition of a little moral courage on the part of the victim would not unfrequently put an end to the black-mailing which the appearance of moral cowardice invites.

The Common Bounce.—Of all the scoundrels that stalk abroad in the world unhung for undetected enormities, this is the most infamous. I never had one of this class pointed out to me in Dartmoor without feeling a sort of longing for some Draconian law or other that would rid mankind at once and for ever of such monsters, and save human nature the shame of having them appear clothed in the forms of men. Yet it is almost exclusively upon the same class of aged victim as the one just described that these infamous wretches ply their calling. In a word, they train young lads, generally thieves whom they are bringing out, to follow such men—always, alas ! old men—as they believe to be "game," and endeavour to entice them to some out-of-the-way place, where the scoundrel who is watching pounces upon the victim, and, under a threat of giving him into custody upon the most abominable of all charges, obtains a sum of money.

To do most professional thieves justice, they never speak of these unique wretches except in terms the most contemptible.

LECTURE XIV.

Provincial Thieves—Professional Jealousy—Foreign Thieves.

PROVINCIAL THIEVES.—In the preceding sketches of the various kinds of crime having representatives in a convict prison, I have mostly confined my remarks to the London and city types of thief, as they constitute so large a proportion of the habitual criminal class of Great Britain and Ireland, and are, especially those from London, the most intellectual, successful, and hardened of all offenders against the law. Liverpool, Birmingham, Manchester, Glasgow, Leeds, and the other large centres of population in the three countries—each send their quota to the class of crimes which I have enumerated; but very few of these extra London professors are equal to their metropolitan brethren in artistic skill in the various methods of theft employed. This is always a subject of boasting to the Cockney jail-bird, but is not unfrequently resented as an aspersion and an injustice by Liverpool and Manchester burglars and pickpockets. The provincial thief has, as a rule, more natural intelligence, if more wanting in general knowledge of men and things, than a Londoner, and is often found to have followed some honest labour at one period of his life. Some exploits performed by Liverpool and Manchester cracksmen have more than rivalled Cockney achievements in skill and daring; and these deeds form a data of fame upon which provincial boasters fall back when it becomes a question of where “the best men” come from. Upon a young Manchester thief, who was employed in one of the parties

to which I was attached in Dartmoor, learning one day that I had resided for some time near that city, he felt himself reinforced whenever London attempted to underrate the genius and pluck of Manchester. Controversies with Cockney rivals were of almost daily occurrence, and taking it for granted that I must be connected with the "profession" somehow, he argued as follows, on one occasion: "Can you" (addressing the Londoner) "show us" (himself and myself) "any job like the boning of the Pacha of Egypt's jewelled sword when he was in Manchester? *That* was cleverness for you—wasn't it?" (appealing to me). "Jack H——," he continued, "who was lately in the Bank" (Millbank), "had a hand in that job, and he's a smart un who can't be beat in all England. Then there was the burst" (burglary) "at the watchmaker's at the corner of Corporation Street, done by little P—— D——, who boned 2,000*l.* worth of swag. Tell us" (the speaker and myself) "where you Cocks have beaten *that*?"

Notwithstanding such bright deeds as those just boasted of, or of such as are not seldom performed by Parisian and Dublin professors—the latter sometimes considered more than the equals of the Londoners—the Cockney thieves are unquestionably at the head of the thieving profession in all its branches, as well as being by far the most hardened and least amenable to reformatory efforts of all criminals to be met with in this country, or perhaps in any other part of the world.

Country Thieves.—By this class of criminal is meant such as are convicted from rural localities, as distinguishable from those who belong to provincial cities and large towns. They are not largely represented in convict society, owing, of course, to the absence in country districts of the criminal-forming agencies such as abound in London, as also the non-presence of temptations to evil that are found principally where luxury and wealthy idleness are fond of exhibiting their riches.

They are the "bad characters" of a rural district who have

graduated in crime either through drinking habits at the village *alehouse*, or from having received one or two sentences in country prisons for poaching, and learning, from association with professional thieves, the career which generally ends in a sentence of penal servitude. They are an unpopular class of men in a convict prison, owing to their being quite at home in such rough kind of manual labour as shovel, pick, or barrow work—each and all of which kinds of occupation, as also any task requiring bodily exertion, are as abhorrent to the entire city thieving classes as bacon is to a Jew. By being able and willing to go through their work easily they show up the idle propensities of the other thieves in the party, and thereby beget an antipathy which tends to still widen the breach between the representatives of vulgar and civilised crime. They are usually ignorant men, and nothing like as hardened in crime as their city brethren. Very few of them are ever re-convicted to penal servitude, as they either leave the country when liberated, or join the army or navy. As thieves they are of course held in the smallest possible estimation by the accomplished city burglars and hooks.

Foreign Thieves.—A good sprinkling of French and German, with some Italian, thieves are found in all the large convict prisons, in almost every instance convicted from London. They are far more intelligent men and more enlightened than their English *confrères* in crime. Some whom I have conversed with I have found very well educated, speaking two or three languages besides their own. As thieves they are poorly spoken of by the London professors, though from their superior intelligence and less criminally marked features and deportment I should incline to the belief that they are “men of mark” when at home. This is said more particularly of French thieves than of the other foreigners whom I have ranked with them. I am of opinion that very few could be found among even the most famed London hooks, who could “break off a jerry” in the

following artistic manner, which bespeaks a *coup de génie* on the part of the Parisian professor of whom it has been often related.

An Englishman, exhibiting a large gold albert, and other "milor" marks of his wealth and insular importance, was one day patronising the Boulevard des Italiens, when he was respectfully saluted by an English-speaking, gentlemanly-looking native, with a "Would monsieur be so kind as to so far gratify the desire of a lady artist in an opposite window as to stand still for five seconds until she succeeds in taking a photograph of monsieur's face, which she declares exhibits beaucoup de caractère?" "Oh, certainly, *monshure*, with the greatest possible pleasure!" was the response of the flattered Briton. "Just a little turn of monsieur's head, *s'il vous plait*. There, that will do. Mille remerciements. Bon jour, monsieur," and "milor's" vanity lost him his watch.

LECTURE XV.

Miscellaneous Traits and Practices of Criminal Character—Demand for New Penal Legislation—Petitioning the Home Secretary—The Thief on “his Rights”—Malingering—Putting on the “Barmy Stick”—Diamond cut Diamond—How to detect Simulated Insanity—Mick Flanagan and the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland—Injury done to *bond fide* Invalids by “Faiking”—Fatal Results to the Malingerers themselves.

THE foregoing classification of the criminal characters of a convict prison is not given as an absolutely correct one, but merely approximative of what the four conduct classes into which each prison is generally divided will embrace of the various types of criminal that prey upon society. Neither do these descriptive sketches of such types, and their respective *modus operandi* in the pursuit of theft, pretend to embrace either all the kinds of crime committed in these countries, or anything approaching to an illustration of all the schemes and ruses that are employed in their varied plundering avocations.

Numbers of crimes are committed by men who are met with in a prison, and which are talked of and boasted of by them, which could not only not be mentioned here, but which will not even allow of a hint of their true nature to be breathed, so unmentionably foul and loathsome are they. These crimes are seldom if ever alluded to in police trials, as they constitute extra accomplishments or pursuits of beings so deeply sunk in crime and shamelessness that their very souls seem to be the essence of all that is filthy and abominable in a beastly and degraded humanity. The tricks, dodges, and other plans which

I have sketched in my brief descriptions of those who rely upon them for the robbery of the public, constitute the principal and most frequently employed schemes for resort to which so many men are doomed to pass so great a portion of their lives within the walls of a convict prison. There is, of course, very little room in prisons like Portland, Dartmoor, Portsmouth, or Millbank, for the exercise of swindling, thieving, and other kindred practices of professional crime, and the observation of such strange moral characters while under disciplinary restraint is therefore a very interesting study. There is not among any other class of men in this country to be found such a constant talk of "rights," of "law," of "justice," and of the Home Secretary, as is heard from those who for the time being have forfeited almost all rights, who are the avowed enemies of all law, and who know not what justice is when they are defrauding or robbing confiding or unsuspecting victims. While boasting of having committed crimes that were never brought to light, and while planning the perpetration of similar ones when they will be restored to liberty, these men, in the same breath, will inveigh against their convictions with genuine indignation, and threaten to expose judge, jury, detectives, and prison authorities for having acted contrary to law the moment they are in a position to do so before the public.

No party of reformers, social or political, dwell so much upon the absolute necessity there is for "a new Act" as the professional swindler and skilled pickpocket. Scarcely a single batch of "new chums" (prisoners recently convicted) ever came to Dartmoor from Millbank, while I was in the former prison, who did not bring some cheering news of an impending revolution in the law relating to the convict world by the proximate introduction of a new Act into Parliament. At one time it would be promised legislation for shorter sentences and more gratuity upon discharge. Next, it might be the abolition of "the ticket," and the establishment of a penal colony somewhere

in Africa; and again, an Act for the extension of good-conduct privileges, and an increase of rations. These supposed measures would be discussed at Sunday exercise as if their introduction into the House had been fully determined upon by the Home Secretary, and their passage into law a matter of certainty.

Every convict is permitted to petition the Secretary of State upon any matter relative to his sentence or treatment, and this privilege is very extensively availed of by the intelligent portion of convicts. In fact, so numerous must these petitions be from the whole of the convict prisons of England, that the reading of them by him to whom they are addressed, if he were compelled to do so, would require several hours a day for the performance of the task. Until the answer arrives, the petitioner, in most instances, fully believes that the Home Secretary is overhauling the records of the trial, communicating with the judge who passed sentence, and otherwise acquainting himself with all the circumstances and bearings of the case that has been laid before him by the convict petitioner. But should the answer prove unsatisfactory, it is simply because "the Home Secretary has not seen the petition at all, not a blooming line of it," or he would be sure to do justice and reduce the sentence. An individual who would never be troubled by such a thing as conscience in robbing another of all he might possess in the world will threaten the director and Secretary of State upon the whole prison staff if he thinks there is an ounce of meat below the stipulated quantity in his shin-of-beef soup, or if his loaf of bread should chance to be a fraction lighter than the weight mentioned in the rules as his due. "He knows his rights, and he'll have 'em, too, or he'll see what somebody else has to say about the matter," &c., &c.

In order to gain some point upon which he has set his mind the professional thief will make any sacrifice, and scarcely stop at the doing of anything which he thinks may obtain the object

of his desire. "Fetching the farm" (obtaining infirmary treatment) is the one thing in the lagging which the worst type of these men will strain every nerve and resort to every possible device that may be calculated to impose upon the doctor and other officials to get. "Putting on the barmy stick" is one of the plans not unfrequently tried as a means of shirking labour and obtaining the relaxation of discipline and extra dietary treatment allowed by the medical officers to *bonâ fide* invalids. This consists in simulating madness, and in addition to the motives just mentioned it is often resorted to in hopes of securing a removal to some other prison. It very seldom happens that the prisoner succeeds in deceiving the doctor to the desired extent, as prisoners showing any symptoms of insanity are placed under special surveillance, which makes it well nigh impossible for an impostor to deceive his watchers for any length of time.

Devices resorted to by convicts of this type for the purpose of "taking in the croaker," have begot detection dodges on the doctor's part also. One of these was described to me by an educated man who had "done a lagging" in C—— convict prison. Dr. —, of that establishment, was noted for the number of fraudulent ailments which he had exposed as having been successfully passed off upon the medical officers of other prisons. Upon any convict showing symptoms of insanity, real or imaginary, he was at once placed under close observation. He would be located in an empty cell, and the first day's proceedings would commence by the administration of a powerful aperient disguised in some article of food. The patient would be then hurried into a warm bath, and, during the absence from his cell, an ordinary empty dinner-tin would be slipped inside the door, and the observations of the watching warder continued after the bathing was over. When the medicine began to operate, the patient would utilise the dinner-tin as the only utensil or convenient article to be found in his cell. This

would all be noted, of course, through the spy-hole by the warder. Dinner time comes round. The tin is smuggled out of the cell without the act being noticed by the patient, and is, after a while, handed in again as if containing the rations of the prisoner. He is again closely watched. *If he eats of the contents, he is believed to be insane. If he does not, he is reported to the director for a flogging for simulating madness.*

This system of detection was confined to C—— prison, and was only resorted to there by the doctor alluded to; but I am bound to say that no such abominable practice was adopted towards even known “barmy stick” prisoners during my stay in Millbank, Dartmoor, Portsmouth, or Portland.

These impostors will carry their acting to the extent of inflicting wounds upon themselves, tearing and smashing what can be thus destroyed, and behaving in the most violent manner towards prisoners or warders.

One of these, who was in Dartmoor during my sojourn there, had almost gained his point and won a recognition of his “insanity” from the doctor, so well did he play his part, when he was caught on one occasion endeavouring to get a look at the paper upon which the warders were instructed to narrate the proceedings and symptoms of the patient. As this intelligent curiosity could scarcely be reconciled with madness, “Barmy Flanagan,” as he was termed, was deservedly punished, and cured. He had been a soldier in the British army ere enlisting in the thieving service, and one of his dodges, while feigning madness, was the writing of a letter to his grandmother in Ireland, requesting her to “go and tell the Lord-Lieutenant that Mick Flanagan is in Dartmoor, and requests a visit from His Majesty in order to renew old acquaintance and be present when I make my will, as I intend to leave 5,000*l.* to the doctor for the kind treatment he has given me.” Others cover themselves with their own filth and go through the most horrible actions in the hope of deceiving the medical officer, ending in

nearly every instance by having ministered to their own suffering instead of obtaining the trivial luxuries for which all this heavy, self-inflicted punishment is undergone. This, like every other species of heartless imposture, leads to the injury of the poor wretches who really do become insane in prison, as it prolongs the period during which the prisoner exhibiting such symptoms must be kept under close observation in order to test the case, and when the "barmy sticks" are detected they are deservedly punished.

Another and more frequent means of "fetching the farm" is termed "faiking" (malingering), and like the previous kind of imposture is practised only by the lowest type of criminal, such as the pickpocket, bruiser, thief-cadger, and "Her Majesty's bad bargains"—as soldier-convicts are called by the other prisoners. As these are all more or less inoculated with the worst forms of bodily disease, it becomes an easy task for such prisoners to so tamper with themselves as to compel medical treatment to be given them. Among the most common methods of doing this is the procuring of inflammation of some part of the arms, legs, feet, face, or eyes, by the infliction of some slight injury and then applying a piece of copper-wire, or other inflaming agent, that will cause the wounded flesh to swell or fester. Scores of other plans are likewise employed to the same end, often resulting in the infliction of a permanent injury, and not unfrequently purchasing premature death for some who act thus criminally towards their bodily health. Characters who are noted for this kind of prison fraud are very unpopular among the majority of prisoners, as the prevalence of this practice of "faiking" begets a suspicion in the doctor's mind of the genuineness of nearly all ailments and accidents that, of course, are as incidental to those who labour inside as to those who are employed outside prison walls, and thereby subjects those who are suffering from them to unmerited suspicion and the danger of neglect.

LECTURE XVI.

CRIMINAL VANITY.

Inscriptions on the Walls of "the Waiting-for-Sentence Cell" in Newgate
—The Love-Letter—*Slang*: Specimen of Thieves' Latin—Key to same.

THAT weakness or vanity which induces travellers to carve their names upon the Pyramids, rocks or stones near famous sights, walls of Roman and other historic ruins, religious shrines and birthplaces of poets, is very largely developed in criminal character. I recollect having occupied the half-hour during which the jury was considering whether to believe the evidence of respectable witnesses or accept that of a creature who can be truly designated a salaried perjurer in my respect, in reading the inscriptions which covered the walls of the cell—the waiting-room of Fate—in Newgate Prison, to which I was conducted while my future was being decided in the jury-room overhead. Every available inch of the blackened mortar contained, in few words, the name of the writer, where he belonged to, the crime with which he was charged, the dread certainty of conviction, the palpitating hopes of acquittal, or the language of indifference or despair. What thoughts must have swept through the minds of the thousands who have passed through that cell, during the necessarily brief stay within its walls! Loss of home, friends, reputation, honour, name—to those who had such to lose; and the impending sentence of banishment from the world of pleasure or business for years—perhaps for ever—with the doom of penal degradation, toil, and suffering in addition!

Yet, despite all these feelings that crowd upon the soul in these short, fleeting, terrible moments of criminal life, the vanity—or what shall I term it?—of the individual prompts him to occupy most of them in giving a short record of himself, his crime or imputed offence, scratched upon these blackened walls, for other succeeding unfortunates to read!

Most of these inscriptions were in slang, showing that the majority of those who had written them were of the criminal order, and guilty of some, if not of the particular, offence for which they were doomed to await the announcement of their punishment within that chamber of dread expectancy. Not a few, however, consisted of declarations of innocence, invocations of Divine interposition, appeals to Justice, and confidence in the “laws of my country;” while others denoted the absence of all thoughts except those of wife, children, or sweetheart. Some who were awaiting that most terrible of all sentences—death—could yet think of tracing the outlines of a scaffold amidst the mass of surrounding inscriptions, with a “Farewell to life” scrawled underneath. Giving way to the seeming inspiration of the place, and picturing jurors’ faces round that dismal den—dark and frowning, into which the sun’s rays never entered, lit only by a noisy jet of gas which seemed to sing the death-song of the liberty of all who entered the walls which it had blackened—I stood upon the form which extended round the place, and wrote upon a yet uncovered portion of the low sloping roof—

“M. D. expects ten years for the crime of being an Irish Nationalist and the victim of an informer’s perjury.

“*July, 1870.*”

From the ghastly look of the place, the penalty I was about to undergo, and my own thoughts at the moment, I might have most appropriately added the well-known lines from the *Inferno*, which invite those who enter its portals of despair to abandon hope.

Not only on the walls of that never-to-be-forgotten black hole, but on the cell walls and doors in all my subsequent wanderings in penal life—in Millbank, Dartmoor, Portsmouth, and Portland—have I spent hours in deciphering the records of “famous” deeds and particular “professions,” dates of sentences and the penalties awarded to the strange beings who had preceded me along that slow, weary, and heartsore journey of punishment.

Fuller accounts of the professions and proficiency of the occupants would be sure to be always found upon the cell slate, written by them for the envious admiration of the prisoner who was next to be located there. These histories, invariably written in slang, have afforded me much amusement at times, and have been a means, among others, of aiding me in the mastery of the criminal vocabulary, which I have so frequently used in these sketches.

Young thieves would, of course, “blow their own horn” in narrating their sentences and exploits, by taking credit for imaginary deeds of fame, not “honestly” acquired; but old hands could be easily traced in the terse expressions which would record—

“A burst in the City. Copped while boning the swag. 7 stretch, 1869. Roll on 1876. Cheer up, pals.”

Another:—

“Hook. 7 ys. Roll on time.”

Another:—

“Bob White from the Dials. 5 stretch for slugging a copper.”

“Little Dickey from the New Cut. 10 and a ticket. Put away by a moll” (sold by an unfortunate).

And such like information, on through the whole category of crime.

The great majority of convicts hide their real under assumed names, many of them having a fresh “monicker” (name) each conviction, to be dropped, for obvious reasons, upon release.

The giving of names, therefore, in these sketches, reveals nothing that would injure the persons who were the bearers while undergoing their "laggings."

A letter, of which the following is an exact copy, was left by a prisoner in one of the cells which I occupied after receiving sentence in Newgate. It afforded much amusement to the officers of that prison, who kept it in that particular cell, and who called my attention to it upon my removal thereto, in order, I believe, to distract my mind from the sentence that had been passed upon me a couple of days previously.

"Shor ditch—1876.

"DEERE JIM

"i was in quod, doin 14 days when i heerd you was lagged i blakked Polly S——'s peepers who called me names she was fuddled and hit me fust, when i kolered her nut and giv her a fine slugging and her mug was all over blud the spiteful thing bit me she did, and funkyed fight, when we were both taken by the Kopper, and the beek only giv me 14 days, and her got 21 for hitten me fust and been fuddled, cheer up Jim i am sorry wot you are lagged, and i wont pal with nobody wile your in quod. good
by Jim from your tru luv SALLY."

Whether this is the fair one whom the song of the period described—

"Her fighting weight was thirteen stone,
And her maiden name was Sarah,"

I know not; but her love-letter to poor Jim was the means of eliciting from me the first laugh in which I felt inclined to indulge in that early stage of penal servitude.

Slang.—A pickpocket told me the history of his arrest one day in the following language:—

"I was jogging down a blooming slum in the Chapel when I butted a reeler who was sporting a red slang. I broke off his jerry and boned the clock, which was a red one, but I was spotted by a copper who claimed me. I was lugged before the beak, who gave me six doss in the Steel. The week after I was chucked up I did a snatch near St. Paul's, was collared, lagged, and got this bit of seven stretch."

In English this would read as follows :—

“As I was walking down a narrow alley in Whitechapel I ran up against a drunken man who had a gold watch-guard. I stole his watch, which was gold, but was seen by a policeman, who caught me and took me before the magistrate, who gave me six months in the Bastille [Middlesex House of Detention, so named by thieves]. When I was released I attempted to steal a watch near St. Paul's, but was taken again, convicted, and sentenced to seven years' penal servitude.”

The use of slang in prisons is prevalent only among the lower order of thieves, but is, of course, employed by all habitual criminals when in company, or on the theft path outside. Some of the pickpocket fraternity are so addicted to it that their true character might be inferred from its almost constant presence in their conversation.

Thieves' Latin.—This improvement upon slang is more a special criminal method of speech than the ordinary slang, and is of general use among the professional burglar and “hook” orders of thief when in pursuit of game. Its chief peculiarity consists in reversing the position of the syllables of a word containing more than one syllable, and making two syllables of all words having only one in ordinary pronunciation by adding a vowel or liquid consonant to the first or second part of such word. By the application of this simple rule to slang words the “lingo” becomes too complicated for any but the initiated to understand. For instance, if two thieves were prowling for game, and one were to see a policeman, he would shout to his comrade—

“Islema! Ogda the opperca!” which in slang is—“Misle! Dog the copper!” otherwise—“Vanish! See the policeman!”

If a pair of confederates were in company with some “flat,” or easily-deceived person whom they were about to fleece, the lingo would be used as a means by which they would inter-communicate their impressions of the victim in his hearing,

and give directions what was best to do in order to obtain his money—

“A uffma, ill olloswa a alewha. Itchpa the idesna, or utpo the ukedo in the obfa,” would be some of the phrases needed for such an emergency.

In ordinary slang the foregoing would stand as follows—“He is a muff, and will swallow a whale. Pitch the snide, or put your duke in his fob;” and translated into English would read—“He is such a confounded ass that he will stand almost anything. Try the counterfeit coin, or pick his pocket.”

As some words will not admit very well of the necessary transposition of syllables needed to disguise the talk from listening victims or enemies, the first syllables of such words, if immediately following each other, will change places, so that the first syllable, letter, or letters of the second word will become that or those of the first word, and *vice-versâ*. For instance, if Jack had made the discovery that a person whom himself and Bill were following had only a silver watch, the disgusting fact would be told to Jack as follows:—

“I jay, Sack, the okeblo's wack's clite;” which in slang would be—“I say, Jack, the bloke's clock is only a white one;” and in English—“The fellow's watch is only silver.”

The letters “J” and “s” of the words “Jack” and “say” are exchanged; the ordinary lingo rule is followed in reference to the word “bloke” and the “cl” of the word “clock,” and “w” of “white” are exchanged as in the case of the letters “J” and “s.”

LECTURE XVII.

PRISON "POETS."

Chateaubriand's Theory—Effective Criticism of the Governor—The Creative Muses of Newgate, Millbank, Dartmoor, and Portsmouth—Circumscribed Nature of the Poet's Opportunities—Jones, his Lucy, and the Critic—Unwarranted Poetic Licence—Crutchy Quinn Celebrates Seven Prisons—His Autobiography—The Millbank Poet who Beat Shakespeare—His subsequent more Congenial Exploits in Dublin—A Portsmouth School of Poetry—The Muse among Bricks—A Bread and Water Criticism.

PRISON POETS.—I am not about to include in this lecture the mighty muse of a Tasso, or the amorous elegances of a Lovelace or a Waller, or other distinguished patrons of Pegasus who may have strung their lyres and sent forth tuneful song while held in durance vile. My votaries of that steed of song are, as yet, entirely unknown to poetic fame, and I very much fear that such of their performances as a treacherous memory will permit me to rescue from the tablets of cell doors, skilky cans, bottoms of dinner tins, and the less oblivious pages of whitewashed walls, will scarcely rank them among the inspired community of immortal songsters.

Chateaubriand has remarked that man or bird is never so prone to sing as when caged. Whether this be really so or not I cannot venture to say, but certain I am that the criminal "muse" would never be heard, if—

"Stone walls did *not* a prison make
Nor iron bars a cage"

for jail-bird "poets." The "poetry" of prison walls, cell doors, slates, can bottoms, tin knives, and margins of books must, in

the first place, be necessarily of a fragmentary nature, and be wanting in that descriptive power which would require for its exposition more stanzas than one, or more lines than from four to twelve—the ordinary range of most poetic flights of convict genius. In almost every other respect it must also suffer in the important point of execution, owing, chiefly, to the fact that all such performances, no matter how truly inspired or instinctive with condensed thought or beauty, are held to be by prison critics—that is, warders—"defacing" the walls, doors, &c., and are made a vulgar question of bread and water to the hungry author when translated on a slip of paper in the form of a report for the final opinion of that stern reviewer, the governor. There is no prohibition, however, in regard to the use of a slate, but unfortunately my reading has been almost exclusively confined to the contents of the former more circumscribed mediums of written convict song. I noticed that Clerkenwell House of Detention failed to evoke a single poetic sentiment, or to stir a particle of the divine fire in its inmates, while *in transitu* to liberty or other stage of imprisonment. Newgate gave birth to but a very selfish sentimentality or the severely sarcastic, notwithstanding its historic record. Millbank seemed to inspire a livelier strain, with wider sympathies, while the sarcasm which it also evoked was a means by which disappointed gourmands revenged themselves upon the culinary *chef* of that famous establishment. Dartmoor and Portsmouth gave each their peculiar idiosyncrasies to the widening stream of breathing thought and burning word. This poetic development in proportion to the degrees of captivity represented by the foregoing stages of waiting trial, conviction, probationary existence, and the full creative influence of heavier tasks and fuller rations, with correspondingly growing experiences of Chateaubriand's cage, seems to bear out that famous writer's theory in a very conclusive manner.

The first book which I was given to read in Newgate had

been in the hands of two poets of an opposite school of feeling when inditing their respective contributions to the spare margins of that volume. The first, who was evidently of the sentimental class, poor fellow, had written—"Good-bye, Lucy dear," throughout the book, upwards of as many times as the love-smitten hero of *As You Like It* had carved the name of Rosalind on the trees of Arden Forest, ere he ventured to clothe his feelings in more musical language, but finally dashed off—

"Good-bye, Lucy dear,
I'm parted from you for seven long year.

"ALF. JONES."

This modest performance, to which the lamenting poet courageously affixed his name, contained a story of love and misfortune, and should, on that account alone, have appealed to the charitable criticism of all who might read the same. But right underneath this effort of the love-sick Jones, a sour and sceptical Jeffrey had added the following verse:—

"If Lucy dear is like most gals,
She'll give few sighs or moans,
But soon will find among your pals
Another Alfred Jones."

Like all unmerciful critics, this heartless wretch, who was evidently himself a sufferer from some fair one's slight, or perhaps evidence, refused to attach his name to his contribution, but fortunately for Lucy's *inamorato* the stigma which was thus cast upon her constancy and that of her whole sex would fall under his notice only in case of his losing Lucy again after liberation and passing through Newgate in the course of a second lagging.

The next original effusion which met my eye in Newgate, also in the sentimental strain, though of a bolder sweep than that of the poet Jones, was as follows:—

"The judge he seven years gave me, transported to Van Dieman's Land,
Far away from my friends and relations, and the girl with the dark
velvet band."

Now, inasmuch as these lines were written in the city of London in 1869, and that neither thieves nor poets are now transported from England to any more distant region of the world than Dartmoor, the second line of this verse amounts to a most unwarranted stretch of poetic licence, being introduced only to find a rhyme for the sable ornament of the writer's lady love. *À propos* of the description which we find given of this lady, was she the only girl in existence with a dark velvet band? and did she wear it round her neck, or arm, or—but impossible!—was it akin to the sacred ornament which gave rise to the legend—“*Honi soit qui mal y pense*”? Well for the writer that he neglected to affix his name to such a production, as the poetic censor who cut up Jones and his Lucy would have emptied all his wrath upon the anonymous writer's style and taste.

My next selection will be from the muse of Millbank, which, in consequence of change of scenery and the more advanced march of the poets on the song-inspiring journey of penal servitude, is of a more epicurean turn than her sentimental sister at Newgate. Margins of books are no longer available, however, for the preservation of amorous verse or sorrowing ditty for reasons already hinted at, and the substitutes must become as various as the objects celebrated. On the bottom of a dinner can, and written with a nail, I discovered the following:—

“*Millbank* for thick shins and graft at the pump;
Broadmoor for all lags as go off their chump;
Brixton for good-toke and cocoa with fat;
Dartmoor for bad grub but plenty of chat;
Portsmouth a blooming bad place for hard work;
Chatham on Sunday gives four ounce of pork;
Portland is worst of the lot for to joke in—
 For fetching a lagging there is no place like *Woking*.
 “CRUTCHY QUINN, 10 and ticket.”

In one respect this short, but very descriptive, poem appeared to have something of a pretence to more crime than

would give a prison experience sufficient to cover so much ground as eight convict establishments; but as I had the distinguished privilege of not only meeting the poet "Crutchy," but of occupying a cell next to his in Dartmoor a twelvemonth after reading the above, I discovered that he had really passed some portion of time in seven of the prisons whose praise or shortcomings he had so graphically described while doing his "separates" in Millbank for the third time.

His Celtic patronymic reminds me that I have so far left you in complete ignorance as to what is the nationality of prison poets, or in what proportion, rather, they are distributable between England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland. I am a firm believer in the wisdom of the German proverb, that "Neither one's country nor mankind is served by national vanity," and I have, therefore, throughout the whole of these lectures, claimed so very little of professional or poetic genius for my own country, that I am in no fear of being charged with any undue partiality. I am, however, in obedience to the behest of truth, compelled to give two-thirds of the prison poets to the land of Moore.

Crutchy Quinn, despite his surname, I found to be a Saxon, though his own story, told to me as follows, would lead to consistency with his name:—

"I am the brother of the celebrated Corporal Quinn, who took a company of Russians prisoners by his own bravery in the Crimea. I am an inventor, and to my love for the study of invention is due this, my misfortune. I once made a model of a patent diving-bell which would surpass anything of the sort ever invented before. I showed it to a gentleman in London, who had something of the same sort in his nut also. Seeing that my plan was the best, he resolved to put me away, and he did it in this manner. I was walking down Cheapside one day, when this rascal meets me, and asks my opinion of a gold chronometer which he had just purchased for twenty quid. No sooner did I take the watch in my hand than he shouted for

a copper, and gave me into custody for attempting to steal it from him! Did you ever hear of such villainy before in broad daylight?" Upon repeating this story, a few days after having heard it, to a London pickpocket who "knew everybody," he gave me the following as the true history of Crutchy:—"That is all one of Crutchy's blooming yarns. He has been here twice before, and had a new monicker each time. He is not Irish, but a born Cockney, and when he has done this bit he will have spent twenty-five years of his life in quod." Crutchy sustained his reputation as a poet during the time he and I were fellow-prisoners in Dartmoor.

But returning to Millbank. There can be no doubt as to the country that gave birth to the author of the following sad couplet, which I found very appropriately inscribed upon one of the tin knives in that prison:—

"I had for my dinner, ochone! ochone! .
One ounce of mutton and three ounce of bone!"

It was while studying the backs of doors and the bottoms of dinner cans in this establishment, that I first met a convict poet in the flesh. He did me the honour of requesting me to become the critic of a piece of blank verse, which, he declared, had elicited from the schoolmaster an opinion that Shakespeare had nothing equal to it in any of his works. I, of course, suddenly became deeply interested in the individual who could beat Shakespeare hollow, and asked how I could have the pleasure of reading his lines. "Oh, exchange 'slates," he replied. "Nothing easier. We can do it in the morning when the gates are unlocked for chapel." This conversation occurred while returning from prayers; so on the following morning I became possessed of his slate, and found about fifty lines of a medley, which commenced with

"When most alone we are least alone,"

containing nothing but a string of unconnected lines stolen from

Milton, Shakespeare, and Young's *Night Thoughts*. This was discouraging, and would scarcely have earned for Shakespeare's rival a place among my convict poets if I had not met him again under anything but poetic circumstances. Nine years after this incident I was walking along Stephen's Green, in Dublin, one evening, when who should I see coming in an opposite direction, in company with two more individuals, but the well-remembered face of the man who claimed to have beaten the Swan of Avon in Millbank. As I had learned, while his associate in this penitentiary, of his more congenial accomplishments, I ventured to predict to the friend with whom I was chatting when this *rencontre* occurred that some clever burglary or cheat would take place in Dublin ere many days had gone by. Two days afterwards the whole city was thrown into a state of excitement in consequence of numbers of forged 10*l.* National Bank notes having been successfully tendered to various shopkeepers and dealers ere their counterfeit character was discovered. One of the "snide pitchers" was caught, but he was not the leader of the gang—my quondam poetic neighbour of Millbank, doubtless, who had made good his escape; but if he had been caught and subjected to the poetic inspiration of Spike Island, he would, to a certainty, soon aspire to take the laurels from the brow of the author of the *Melodies*.

As Dartmoor was, poetically speaking, in possession of Crutchy Quiun during the whole of my sojourn in that place, truly famous for "bad grub," if not for "plenty of chat," and as I have already given a sample of his poetry, I must pass on to Portsmouth Prison, which, from some cause or other never satisfactorily explained, had the reputation of numbering more poets amongst its criminal population than all the other convict prisons combined. I was told by one of these geniuses that the schoolmaster encouraged poetry among prisoners, and that once a fortnight, on book-changing days, each votary of the Portsmouth

muse would leave his composition on his slate where the prison Holophernes could read it and mark his approval or other opinion for the perusal of the author. This appeared to me as simply exquisite; and I looked forward to a long and constant enjoyment of this community of imprisoned songsters, when, unfortunately for the remainder of this lecture on prison poets, I was sent back to Dartmoor with only a few weeks' experience of my new acquaintances. Short as my stay in Portsmouth was, however, it was not altogether barren of poetic results. Upon my reaching the place where my gang was employed, one morning in the July of 1872, the officer in charge bid me go to the end stack of bricks, and the prisoner who was there at work would teach me how to "skintle," *i.e.* stack wet bricks to dry. The personage to whose teaching I was thus consigned was a little man of fifty or more years of age. Having eyed me very closely on my approach, he saluted me with the startling question, "Are you a *pôte*?"

Somewhat taken aback at the thought that there might be some connection between the composition of poetry and the manufacture of bricks hitherto undreamt of by me, I answered, "No!" "I am," was the proud and prompt reply. "Indeed!" I ventured to observe, "and have you published any works?" "No; but I have made a lot of poetry," he answered in a tone that might have applied to so many barrow-loads of bricks. "Upon what subjects have you chiefly composed?" was my next inquiry. "The pugging machine—" "But what is that, please?" I interrupted. "That is what makes the bricks," was the reply. "Holy Joe." "Who is he, pray?" "Oh! that is our chaplain." "Well?" "I have made some poetry on Pentonville too," he continued, and immediately putting himself in an attitude of poetic frenzy, he recited—

"'Twas one fine morning I left Wakefield Jail,
 Meself and comrades we did cry our fill;
 Far from our friends we were now transported
 Till the same evening we rached Pentonville—"

"If you don't stop that jaw, Horgan, and allow that man *to go on with his work*, I'll give you a run!" broke in the anything-but-musical voice of the warder upon the poet and startled auditor; and as the threatened "run," if carried out, would entail more disagreeable consequences than the combined *critical condemnation of all the literary reviews*, there was no more "poetry" recited that day.

LECTURE XVIII.

DESPAIR AND HOPE IN PRISON.

Fortitude of Ordinary Convicts—Effects of “Solitary” at Beginning of Sentence—Millbank and Big Ben—Horrible Consciousness of Slow March of Sentence—An Instance of Sudden Madness—Death from Want of Hope—A Midnight Tale of Heart-Sorrow—A Murderer’s Extraordinary Hope—Story of Drunkenness and Murder—Convict Castle-Builders.

As it seldom happens that even the worst of criminals is found to be all crime, neither is an association of one thousand of convicts all repulsive moral deformity. Imprisonment, like many other unfortunate occurrences in the life of those who are born under an unlucky star, has what, for want of a more accurate expression, I shall term its bright side also, inasmuch as its life in some very remote respects approaches to that of the less criminal—because unconvicted—outside world. All the talk of a convict prison is not of murder, theft, and indecency, nor is misery and unhappiness always present among those who may be supposed to be the exclusive victims of “grim-visag’d Despair.” Therefore is there what I may call a negative silver lining to even the dark cloud of penal existence. It is a most singular thing that I have met very few individuals in prison who gave evidence, in appearance or talk, of being *truly* miserable, no matter what the length of their sentence, amount of extra punishment, or contrast between their previous and their convict life, may have been. It is true the deepest sorrow and most acute pains of life are often hid from the mockery of

human pity away in the recesses of the sufferer's breast; and that therefore the smiling face and cheerful conversation are not to be relied upon as sure indications of a contented or happy existence. Yet a constant and familiar observation of men of all ages, possessing the strongest of human passions while being subject to disciplinary restraints that have no parallel in the daily annoyance or troubles of outside life, would be almost certain to detect any tendency towards despair or severe heart-suffering on the part of men who should succumb to their fate or surroundings. It is also certain that numbers of prisoners having comfortable homes in the outer world must often indulge in sad regrets for what has lost them their enjoyment, and allow their minds to dwell on the painful contrast between the, perhaps, happy influence and remembrances of the one, and the cheerless and weary aspect of the other, mode of life. But these feelings are seldom or ever exhibited in the general behaviour or talk of four-fifths of the inmates of a convict prison, and happy, indeed, is it for all concerned in their custody that it is so; as such a mass of bridled passions, if maddened by ever-present thoughts of family, home, and former pleasures (while mind and body are made conscious every hour in every day of the terrible penalties which crime has purchased), would become as unmanageable and dangerously restless as a thousand caged hyenas.

It is only when these possible feelings overcome the resisting influence of Hope and Patience—the bright and ever-present guardian angels of the imprisoned—nowhere so needed, and, thanks to a beneficent Providence, nowhere so constantly present and powerful as in a prison, that the heart fails in presence of seemingly unbearable woe, inducing mental aberration and finally insanity in the unfortunate victims. Such cases are, however, not frequent, while the instances of prisoners buoying up their existence under the weight of *life* sentences with the hope of something being done for them some time,

through the agency of some fortunate circumstance or other, are almost as numerous as are such terrible sentences themselves.

The first two years of penal servitude are the hardest to bear, and test mental endurance more than the whole of the remainder of an ordinary sentence. Liberty has only just been parted with. The picture of the outside world is still imprinted upon the memory, and home and friends, with perhaps a dearer object still, are made to haunt the recollection whenever the association of ideas recalls some incidents of happier days. Of these two years the heaviest portion is comprised within the nine or ten months which must be spent in what is termed "probation"—solitary confinement in Millbank or Pentonville; and while "solitary" is not much dreaded by ordinary prisoners at a later stage of penal existence, it is truly a terrible ordeal to undergo at the commencement. In Millbank this is specially so. The prison is but a few hundred yards west of Westminster Palace, from whence comes, every quarter of an hour, the voice of Big Ben, telling the listening inmates of the penitentiary that another fifteen minutes of their sentences have gone by! What horrible punishment has not that clock added to many an unfortunate wretch's fate, by counting for him *the minutes* during which stone walls and iron bars *will* a prison make! Then again there are the thousand and one noises that penetrate the lonely cells and silent corridors of that cheerless abode. Now it is the strains of a band from St. James's Park, "bringing back to the memory merry days long gone by;" next it is the whistle of the railway engine, with its suggestiveness of a journey "home;" and so on, during the long weary days and nights, until the terrible idea of suicide is forced across the mind as the only mode of release from the horrible mockery of the noisy, joyful world beyond the boundary walls.

It is not surprising that many men have gone mad in Millbank. I was but a few weeks an inmate when I had to witness a sad incident of the kind. We were at prayers one morning

in the Catholic chapel, and the choir, made up of prisoners, was singing *one of Father Faber's beautiful supplications to the Virgin Mother*. The air to which the words were sung was one of joyousness and hope, such as would easily cause a listener to travel back to the school-boy period of life, and dwell again on a time ere prison or suffering were much thought of. Suddenly a wild, heart-bursting cry rang out above the voices of the singers, from a convict of some forty-five years of age, a few seats removed from where I was seated. He rushed towards the altar with piercing shrieks, while his eyes and face proclaimed the sudden loss of reason and the presence of madness. I thought at the time that the hymn, or the air to which it was being sung, might have brought up to the wretched man's memory the voices of his children and the thought of the years that must elapse—years of penal servitude, too—before he could again see or hear them, and that under this frightful strain upon the mind and heart he suddenly became a raving maniac.

Two instances of somewhat more natural, but scarcely less tragic, consequences comprise the number of cases in which I have observed the evidence of overmastering despair in convict life. In the early years of my sentence, in Dartmoor, I became acquainted with a very quiet and very intelligent prisoner named Howard, who bore a most excellent character, as far as prison conduct could show. His story was indeed a sad one. He was upwards of sixty years of age, and had resided in Liverpool mostly all his life. His wife had been a confirmed drunkard for years, from which circumstance it was easy to credit his assertion that their marriage had been an unhappy one, and his life a misery in consequence. He came home from his work one evening to discover that she had pawned some article of furniture in order to obtain money for more drink, whereupon an altercation ensued, which caused the wretched woman to rush from the room and tumble down a flight of stairs, at the bottom of which she was found with a broken neck. Overcome

with remorse at the thought that his scolding had been the cause of her fall, Howard was overheard by two women to exclaim, in agony, "My God! I have killed my wife!" This was given in evidence against him at the subsequent inquest and trial, and he was sentenced to penal servitude for life. Conscious of his innocence of the crime of murder, and relying upon his former good character and exemplary prison behaviour, he was confident that he would obtain his liberation after three years' imprisonment. He petitioned the Home Secretary, told his story, and awaited the reply, which he fully believed would see him again a free man. The reply came in due time: the Secretary of State saw no grounds for interfering with the sentence of the judge. Within a month after the receipt of this second sentence to his cherished hope, Howard was freed by death from the life of penal servitude.

The remaining instance had not so fatal an ending.

I was kept awake late one summer night in 1874 by the unusual spectacle of the moon's rays penetrating through my cell window. It was the first time I had had such a visitor during four years, and the circumstance had touched a chord of memory and set the mind upon a train of thought which was not friendly to repose. The night-guard, in muffled tread, had glided past my cell door like a ghostly shadow, and all was as still within the prison as the midnight silence of a churchyard. From beyond the walls there came, at intervals, the barking of some farmer's dog, as if my new-found lamp of night were keeping him awake also; and in the midst of this stillness, at an hour when—

"Sleep on its downy pinions flies from woe
To light on lids unsullied by a tear,"

a timid knock was given to the partition which divided my cell from the next prisoner, and an eager, sobbing voice exclaimed, "Can you, dear sir, tell me if Mary is dead?" Startled at the intensity of suffering which could prompt so heart-breaking an

appeal for information from a complete stranger, I found it impossible to reply, until I heard again, as if in answer to my silence, "Ah, yes! she *must* be dead. My God! what will become of my children!" No matter how little a heart may be attuned to human sympathy, it must partake more or less of the agony which makes a strong man writhe in pain; and the knowledge which my unknown neighbour's question gave me of suffering so near to me, and so far surpassing that upon which I had been selfishly ruminating that night, chased all thoughts of sleep from my mind. I soon learned the history of the stranger's life, and the cause of his heartache. He had but arrived in Dartmoor from Millbank a few days previous to the incident just related, and was only a year in prison altogether. He had been a stonemason in Swansea before getting into trouble, and the cause of his imprisonment was this. He came home from work one Saturday evening "a little fresh," but not drunk, and finding his wife in tears he demanded what was the matter, and was told by his eldest child, a girl seven years old, that a man who lived across the street had insulted her mother. Morris, the name of the man of whom this is related, rushed out with a chisel in his hand and attacked the person who had offered insult to his wife, leaving him desperately wounded in his own house. For this he was tried and sentenced to seven years' penal servitude; and from the day of conviction until the night on which he recounted to me his sorrows, he had heard no word from or of his wife or children. I never knew that man to smile during the time he spent in Dartmoor. His existence seemed to be one perpetual sorrow, and he formed altogether the most striking exception to the rule of non-despairing prisoners which came under my notice during my long intercourse with Dartmoor's criminal population.

The contrary feeling of hope is the prevailing one among prisoners, especially among those having long sentences. The less reasonable the cause for clinging to what is often but a

straw in the sea of desperation, the more tenacious is the hold that is kept of it. One such instance has struck me as being a most remarkable evidence of hope being a providential gift with the power of saving reason, and often life, when everything else appears to abandon both to melancholy, madness, or death, and may be mentioned here as a sample of what tends to keep despair at bay within the walls of a convict prison.

In the second party to which I was attached for labour in Dartmoor, was a man named Slack, a very quiet, intelligent, and remarkably well-conducted prisoner, who had at that period (1873) completed seven years of a sentence of twenty without having had a single report marked against him for misbehaviour of any kind. His crime was the murder of his wife, who, from his own apparently truthful statement, was the worst of bad life-partners, an habitual drunkard. He had been the owner of two or three canal-boats and other property in the neighbourhood of D——, and as fast as he could earn money his wife would squander it in drink. He finally went on the spree also, came home drunk one night, and, in a quarrel that ensued, committed the horrible offence for which he was sentenced to twenty years' imprisonment. In fact, he admitted he had got drunk purposely with the intention of doing under the influence of drink what he had not the conscience to attempt when sober—to rid himself of his sot of a wife. There must have been extenuating circumstances in the case, or Slack would have been sentenced to the gallows. He made over all his property in charge to his brother until he should be released, leaving with it the task of endeavouring to obtain either his release or a reduction of his sentence from the Home Secretary. After the completion of one year he received a short letter from the brother counselling hope, and telling him not to expect any further communication until there would be some good news to send, hoping that that would not be long.

“And have you not heard from your brother these six years?”

I asked one day, after listening to his story of drink, murder, and repentance.

"Oh, no," he replied. "Did not he say I need not expect to have a letter again until he could send a good one? I am expecting one now every day, and I think that as I have just finished seven years the Secretary of State will send me my release, coming on Christmas."

Shortly after this conversation Slack was removed to some other prison, and I lost sight of him for a little over five long years more, when he turned up again in Dartmoor, through being included in a batch of transfers from Portsmouth, to which prison he had been previously removed. A few weeks before the realisation of my own long-cherished hopes I met Slack one Sunday at exercise, and upon inquiring if he had any expectation of release, he repeated, almost word for word, the reply he had made to a similar question five years earlier, adding only, "As I have done *twelve years* now without a report, I am certain the Secretary of State will soon discharge me." If that unfortunate wretch was told what those who listened to his story believed of his brother's conduct, he would probably have been released by death ere he had served half the term he had then been in prison.

This all-sustaining prison virtue, Hope, necessarily begets a kindred sort of comforting delusion in prisoners, adapting itself to the seeming requirements of those whose lot is hardest, and hiding the worst features of the objective present behind a picture of a pleasant and happy, if imaginary, future. Prison is the paradise of castle-builders—the fruitful dreamland of fortunes to be made, happiness to be won, and pleasures to be tasted, that shall more than compensate for the trials and privations of the past by the double enjoyment of their intrinsic delights and the contrast which their possession will make to the days when prison walls had frowned upon liberty and prison rations had but little comparison with the food of the gods.

Alnaschar himself never conjured up so glorious a picture of gratification that was to come as will the imaginative convict while employed at his daily task, or in confiding his plans and prospects of the future to some one who will lend an attentive ear to their narration. Apart from such of the airy structures that are erected upon projected crime, this phase of criminal mental activity often conducts the stream of convict talk from its ordinary track on ugly themes into a more pleasant channel, in which it is easy to learn something of the better side of those whose blacker deeds and criminal ideas I have already endeavoured to sketch.

LECTURE XIX.

CONVICT READING AND FAVOURITE LITERATURE.

Influence of Literature upon Criminal Minds—Suggestions for a Prison Library—Criminal Aversion to Direct Religious or Moral Teaching—The Periodical Literature of a Prison Library—The Religion of Criminals in Prison.

THE novel, and works of travel, with the varied reading of such magazines as are permitted into a prison library, are the favourite selections of convicts; and as none of the sensational or questionably moral kind of the former branch of English literature are allowed inside a prison, the influence for good which the higher class of such works might be capable of exercising upon almost morally deadened heads and hearts is scarcely appreciated by those of the public who question the wisdom and lenity of allowing convicts the privilege of reading romances. In my opinion no more efficacious reforming medium—apart, of course, from industrial occupation and habits—could be employed for the reclamation of all that is reclaimable in criminal lives than a judiciously stocked prison library, in which the moral-teaching and wrong-punishing description of novel should be largely represented—where truth and honesty are made to triumph over their opposite vices, and the precepts and duties of religious, moral, and industrial citizenship are held up as the standard of social obligations, and the surest guarantees of worldly happiness and prosperity. Direct Scripture or moral teaching, either through religious works or the labours of prison chaplains, is all

but useless with criminals, and, as a method, is as unpopular in the work of obtaining reformatory results as direct taxation would be to the grumbling citizen, if all he really does pay had to be parted with in a painfully objective manner. But let a method of indirect teaching be resorted to, no matter how moral the ideas or religious the lessons taught, if but accompanied with narrative, interesting delineations of character, and something approaching to a plot, and every sentiment and every line will be read and talked over. In fact it is only what prisoners read between labour hours in prison that can come between themselves and their thoughts of crime past, and reveries of criminal deeds to come; and too much cannot be done in the way of supplying healthy and acceptable mental food to be placed in opposition to the criminal broodings of morally perverted minds. For work of this kind too much praise cannot be bestowed upon the serial publications issued by Cassell and Company, Messrs. Chambers of Edinburgh, and a few others of a more decidedly religious tone, such as the *Leisure Hour*, *Sunday at Home*, *Good Words*, *The Lamp*, &c.

In respect to these latter mediums of moral instruction, it is a pity that sectarianism is so often displayed in their pages that the Catholic chaplains of convict prisons interdict their delivery to Catholic prisoners. This is unfortunate, as the only Catholic serial publication found in a convict prison library, namely, *The Lamp*, is not of itself adequate to the performance of the good offices fulfilled for Protestant prisoners by the numerous journals which they are privileged to read. No more effective reformer ever entered the gates of a prison than *Cassell's Family Magazine*, with its select stories, its charming pictures of *home life*, its lessons upon most subjects that belong to the sphere of the intelligent artisan class of society, and its instructive, moral, cheerful, and piquant *tout ensemble*. Nor, in alluding to the importance of instilling pure thoughts and clean ideas into morally diseased minds, should *Chambers's Journal*

and *Papers for the People* be omitted. Apart from the moral good which these three last periodicals have undoubtedly achieved among those convicts who have been made familiar with them in prison, I owe them a debt of gratitude myself for the many pleasant hours which they have been the chief means of enabling me to pass where otherwise the very idea of pleasure was but a mockery and a pain.

The next kind of favourite prison literature is biography, in which department there is also ample scope for the inculcation of doctrines and precepts that would be certain of rejection if offered in the form of direct religious teaching. Half a prison library might be stocked with biographies of self-made and remarkable men, the struggles and achievements of whose lives would constitute the best class of reading that could be offered to those who, above everything else, stand in need of instruction by example.

With the exception of poetry and history, the remaining branches of English literature represented in a prison library are not very much patronised by convicts, the general demand upon the schoolmaster being for the lighter kind of reading, and of this in the order in which I have specified it.

I have talked with a number of professional thieves who had acquired a knowledge of French somewhere, and who were more or less familiar with the French poets and most celebrated writers in that language, while possessing a very fair proficiency in the literature of their own country. Such men had probably mastered French while in companionship with French thieves in prison, French grammars for the use of convicts who are Frenchmen being among the educational books allowed to prisoners. These helps, and the presence of numbers of Frenchmen in nearly every convict establishment, who would, of course, give and take in the way of linguistic instruction, is another explanation. I was one day in exercising file with a "flash" or swell young pickpocket who had succeeded in picking up a

smattering of French, of which he was very vain. Upon the termination of his sentence he was resolved upon leaving "this blooming stupid land of England and going to reside in France."

"What to do?" I was curious enough to ask.

"Why, to do the aristocrat," was his reply. "Little Jemmy S——, who was in 'the tailors' party, and myself are to go together, and represent ourselves as two English lords."

"Well, and how do you intend to work the oracle?" I inquired.

"Supposing," he answered, "one of us to succeed in obtaining an introduction to a very swell family, we could easily bone their jewellery and other valuable swag. Jemmy, who is reckoned a first-class hand at almost everything, would get up in the night-time, do the place, and let it be supposed that the house was rifled by French thieves."

"But how would you get the swag removed?"

"Oh! as to that," he replied, "why, I would be under the window with a wheelbarrow, and secure all the swag in that way."

A very nice position for a pair of English lords!

The Religion of Convicts.—There is nothing touching the prison welfare of a convict so carefully looked to by the prison authorities as his religion. The portion of the prison rules which deals with that part of a prisoner's treatment is so carefully read over to him, and so explained, that it is impossible for a follower of one particular creed to find himself classed as a member of any other, or compelled to be present at a religious service to which he has not previously consented to attend. This, of course, is as it ought to be; yet one who should infer from it that all the members of convict Protestant or Catholic congregations were respectively all Protestants and Catholics, would fall into a good-sized error. With the exception of non-Cockney Irish Catholics and Scotch Presbyterians, the particular religion of an habitual jail-bird is a matter of very

little concern to himself, and is made a secondary consideration to less worthy motives.

If a London thief, professing Protestantism, should have a pal undergoing a term of penal servitude who was a Catholic, he would, to a certainty, class himself as a member of the latter faith after being sentenced, in hopes of falling in with his old chum somewhere and at some period during the lagging; while a similar object would guide the religious profession of a London Catholic "gunn" if the case was reversed.

In addition to this motive in the matter of choosing a religion, the point is also determined by the particular faith which was professed in a previous imprisonment, should the prisoner be a re-convicted prisoner, as this class of criminal very rarely appears under the same religious banner again, unless compelled by the number of his convictions, and the scarcity of creeds, to fall back upon an old faith.

There was one of this class in Dartmoor, named Barmy Harrison, who had gone through three laggings in that prison, each in connection with a separate religion. He was first a Jew, next a Protestant, and then a Catholic; and upon my asking him one day how he would shift when convicted again (as convicted he would be, if there was anything in London to be stolen for the sake of theft), he answered that he would put himself down as a follower of Mohammed. Owing to the Catholic chaplain prohibiting nearly all the serial journals included in the prison library (to which I have already alluded) from circulation among Catholic prisoners, numbers of the latter not only put themselves down as Protestants when re-convicted, but demand that they be permitted to change during the imprisonment upon that account alone. As all parties concerned—Protestant and Catholic chaplains—consent in most instances to this arrangement, the desired religious transfer is made, and the "conscience" of the convert is quieted. Reasons often occur on the other side, also, which induce some who are

Protestants to go over to the side of Rome for the remainder of the sentence, and, of course, to profess neither faith for an hour after the sentence shall expire.

The Scotch Presbyterian, however, will never turn Catholic, no matter how often he is lagged, or what the inducement may be that would turn the thoughts of other Protestants in that direction ; and on their part the same may be said in reference to "conversion" of nearly all Irish Catholic prisoners, the aforementioned Cockney Irish excepted. It would be a mistake, however, to infer from this religious "consistency" that those who show such evidence of an allegiance to one faith are therefore considerably less inclined to the commission of crime than the indifferent. It is by no means the least of the many saddening reflections which a prison experience engenders, that religion in prison is in nine cases out of ten put on either for dishonest purposes, or assumed in the no less reprehensible game of hypocrisy.

LECTURE XX.

PRISON ANECDOTES.

In the Wrong Hotel—Negative Definition of a Gentleman—Unappreciated Merit—Cause for an English Revolution—How an Irish Republic Lost an English Advocate.

IN THE WRONG HOTEL.—The hour of bed-time in Newgate—six o'clock—did not invite a sudden falling off into an obliviousness of a sentence of fifteen years. When one is but twenty-three years of age and has only a two months' experience of the loss of liberty and one day of actual penal servitude, all that such a fate includes at that period of life was not easy to drown in slumber at such an hour. In addition to this source of wakefulness, the thousand and one noises of London that pierce the walls of Newgate would make sleep impossible on the first night after all hope of liberty had been crushed out of the heart by a terrible sentence, at least until the small hours of morning should silence the disturbing cries. The hour of midnight had just struck from the belfries of all the churches in the vicinity, St. Paul's toning down the jingling concert with its thick mellow strokes; while the rich bass of Big Ben came lumbering up the Thames and across the City with its melancholy chimes of the "Old Hundredth," as if it were anxious to sing all other noises to silence and repose, when the signal-bell in the cell next to mine sent its sharp warning through the whole corridor, as if it too had been set in motion through a sympathy with the hundred bells that had just died out on the midnight air. After a few minutes' silence the signal was again struck

accompanied, this time, by some indistinct muttering, as if the person who had pulled it was in bad humour with whatever necessity awoke him from slumber. Anon the slow tread of the night guard passed by my door, and, pausing at that of the disturber, I heard a sharp voice say, "Well, what is it?" The reply was so inaudible that I failed to catch any portion of it but the word "want," and from the answer which it elicited from the guard I guessed that some unusual request had been made by my next-door neighbour. "Oh! is that all? You have made a slight mistake, my man, and come to the wrong place. Go to bed." And after delivering himself of this piece of advice, the guard repassed my door, and all was silent for a couple of minutes. Bang! goes the signal-bell again; and evoking no response, my neighbour, who had now recovered his voice, shouted, loud enough to be heard all over the prison, "Waiter! I say, waiter!" No response, of course. Loud muttering by the voice, as if he was expressing in anything but polite language his appreciation of the party for whom he was calling, when—bang! goes the signal again, while the impassioned individual followed it up with, "Waiter, I tell you I can't find the matches! I want a light and a glass of brandy-and-water." A titter of half-suppressed laughter from the adjoining cells told me that my neighbour had enlarged his audience by his demands, when the signal was struck once more. No response. The voice, manifestly suffering from feelings of evident disgust, shouted, "Is there no use in my ringing or shouting, waiter?" No reply. The voice again, this time as if moralising with himself, "Well, I have been in a good many hotels in my time in London and elsewhere, but such a d——d place as this is I never put up in before. Waiter!" thundered at the cell door, somewhere near where the keyhole should be. No response. The voice, in a towering rage, and as if intended to penetrate to that supposed region where mine host would be likely to hear it—"Bring me my bill! I won't stop another

hour in this d——d place!" A shout of laughter from the whole corridor at this threat to dispatronise the "hotel" Newgate brought the guard instanter again to the scene of the disturbance, and after a few words from him as to the "slight mistake" into which my neighbour had fallen, the place resumed its former silence, the guard muttering in passing my door, "A fit of the blues."

A Negative Definition of a Gentleman.—One of the most unpopular among the prisoners in Dartmoor during his stay in that prison was an individual who passed himself off as a Major-General H——, and to whom I have already alluded in some of my remarks upon aristocratic impostors. He was a man of very commanding presence, and had, probably, been a private in the Guards ere commencing his swindling career. But if his military air, assumed rank, and lofty demeanour had enabled him to pass himself off upon portions of the outside public as somebody in particular, they failed to gain him anything from the thievocracy of Dartmoor save a constant warfare of petty annoyance. This he, to some extent, merited at their hands from his contemptuous behaviour towards any of them who chanced to get into the same exercising file along with him, and his constant boast that he was no thief, but a "gentleman." His claim to the latter distinction was, of course, as much ridiculed as his assumed military rank, and both of these pretensions were the means of keeping him in hot water with the rest of the prisoners with whom he was associated. One of those whom he had one day snubbed for venturing to speak to him, put me the following question a few days afterwards, in reference to the "general" and himself:—"Look here, you answer me this: Whether is a bloke who is a pickpocket, and honest enough to admit it, or a fellow who has been a swell swindler and has been lagged for bigamy, but tries to pass himself off as a gentleman, the biggest scoundrel?"

I felt bound to decide against the latter, as he was guilty of

two species of scoundrelism to the former's one ; whereupon my interrogator exclaimed—"I thought so ; and the next time the 'general' snubs me, I'll give him a punch on the blooming nose."

The "general's" last offence, I may here remark, was a case of heartless bigamy. He had succeeded in introducing himself to a young lady in London who possessed a small fortune of 600*l.*, to obtain which he committed this crime ; and being tried and convicted received five years' penal servitude. This fact, added to his conduct towards those who had been guilty of less infamy than had been brought home to himself subjected him to all the persecution which could be given without attracting the attention of the warders ; while no one could be induced to sympathise with him owing to his repellent behaviour and ridiculous assumptions. There was one exception, however, to this, in the conduct of a young Irish lad, named Mulligan, whom the "general" had patronised, ostensibly because he was not a thief—Mulligan having been sentenced, as expressed by himself, "for flooring a policeman with a poker." The "general" condescended to walk and talk with Mulligan, while Mulligan would threaten to box whoever should cast a suspicion upon his patron's claims to a gentleman's position in outside society. "I tell ye he *is* a gentleman," Mulligan would say. "Don't I know a gentleman from a thief and robber ? and didn't he tell me that his house has railin's round it ! What do the likes of ye know about a gentleman !" After a time the true nature of his partiality for Mulligan began to show itself, as the latter was observed to save most of his bread ; and the rumour went around that Mulligan was "slinging toke" (giving his bread) to the "general." This only tended to increase the unpopularity of the latter when it was known he was accepting the poor lad's loaves while on light-labour rations, and the whole of No. 2 prison, where the parties were located, became a "razor" upon him for this fresh proof of his meanness. Nothing, however, would make the slightest impression upon Mulligan's

faith in the respectability of the man who was growing fat upon his generosity, until the object of it overdid his part one day, and henceforth placed Mulligan in the ranks of his enemies. The "general" and his inseparable companion had just commenced exercising one fine frosty morning, such a morning as would give any healthy person a keen appetite, when the following dialogue was overheard between them :

General. " Now, Mulligan, I am more and more delighted with your society every day, as I find you are a manly and intelligent little fellow ; and let me see, now, if you can't bring me out your pudding to-morrow."

Mulligan (indignantly). " Now luk here, ginerall, this is comin id too much altogetther ! When all the prison was agin you and said you was an imposthor, I tuk your part, and said you were a gintleman ; but now I find out you are nothin' of the sort ; for a thrue gintleman would never take a man's bread to-day, and thin ask him for his puddin' to-morrow ! I tuk pity on you because you were a big man, but as I find you are no gintleman, don't expect bread or puddin' from me any more."

Unappreciated Merit.—One of the labour gangs to which I was for some time attached after my arrival in Dartmoor was made up of eight prisoners—six London pickpockets, a Yorkshire thief known as Old Peter, and myself. The work at which we were employed offered considerable latitude for talk, on which privilege the Cockney hooks were only too prone to seize, in order to recount to each other the thieving exploits and police adventures in which they had figured during their respective careers. The six Londoners would always so arrange their work as to remain, if possible, within talking distance of each other, while completely ignoring the presence of Old Peter and myself. This arrangement was by no means as agreeable to Peter as it was to me, for he was forced thereby to a labour association with one who was altogether outside the profession, being thus deprived of all the pleasure which the professional

company of six seemed to enjoy in congenial society. Often have I been amused at seeing Old Peter hovering near the charmed circle, as a schoolboy would cling to a wall inside of which a game of football was being played, from any participation in which he would be rigorously excluded by the selfish gamesters; and I could easily fancy the old fellow lamenting the unlucky fate which had fixed his birthplace in Yorkshire instead of in London. Something more than usually piquant was being talked over one day by the privileged six that threw them into occasional fits of merriment, and which put Old Peter into a correspondingly depressed mood through being a witness of what he had not the gratification of participating in. It was more than flesh and blood could stand to be thus "so near and yet so far" from the object of one's desire; so Old Peter, mustering up fresh resolution, took his shovel and walked to the place where the six were working and chatting, and commenced to dig and listen. A costermonger intruding into a Belgravia drawing-room could not be more promptly expelled than was poor Peter, who was indignantly asked "What did the old gowk want there?" Thus unfeelingly repelled, Peter walked slowly back to where I was standing, a witness of his humiliation, and, leaning upon his shovel as if in the agony of disgrace, he muttered, "I'm a gowk! Ov coorse I'm nowt, becose I dunno cum fro Lunnon! Bud I'll tell thee wod" (fiercely addressing me), "I stowl watches forty yer sin—long afore them chaps wer born! Bud" (continued he sorrowfully, while resuming his work near me) "that's nowt, becose—I dunno cum fro Lunnon!" I have often thought that Old Peter's was as cruel an instance of unappreciated merit as any that came under my observation while studying the caste of crime.

Cause for an English Revolution.—The addition of a "new chum" to the wards of any convict prison is a matter of excitement to the prisoners therein located until it becomes known who he is, where he has come from, and for what particular

offence he has been introduced to penal society. If information on these points be not at once obtainable, the new-comer is described to be just what his particular neighbours desire him to be. A little extra officiousness on the part of the Millbank warders having surrounded my entrance into that establishment, it became somewhat difficult for the inquisitive prisoners to learn what would satisfy their curiosity in my regard. For a couple of days after my "reception" I was constantly being interrogated as to where I had been "collared," what I had "boned," and where I had done my "last bit." These questions would be addressed to me after meal times while the warders would be absent from the wards—a time when loud whispering could be carried on through the curious inspection holes which formed a peculiar feature in the architecture of the Millbank cells.

On the second evening in my new lodgings I went to the spy hole, after hearing the turnkey lock the ward gate and descend the stairs to his tea. Skilly had just been served out to the thirty inhabitants of that particular ward, and a furious application of wooden spoons to the bottoms of empty cans spoke eloquently of the appetites of my new associates. After the noise had subsided

A voice exclaimed—"I say, Bill, were you ever choked off with such blooming thin skilly in all your lagging?"

Bill, from a cell higher up the ward—"The blooming gov'nor fattens his pigs with the meal and only allows one ounce for a pint."

Another voice—"I say, pals, who is the new chum in No. 7" (my cell) "who won't mag?" (talk.)

First voice—"He has done a tenner in Gib for a burst in the city, and is sent back on his ticket."

A fourth voice—"Get along, you duffer! He has only one duke" (arm), "and the orderly told me to-day that he has got fifteen stretch for being a Fenian."

Bill's chum, sympathetically—"Poor fellow! I knew a lot a

Fenians when I was a doin' my last bit in Woking. They were rare chums for slinging toke!" (giving away bread.)

After which, the same voice, by way of encouragement—"It's time there was a blooming revolution in England when a bloke like me gets seven stretch for boning a coat, and gets skilly like this to live upon!"

I immediately collapsed.

How an Irish Republic lost an English Advocate.—I was accosted while at exercise one morning in the stone-breaking party in Dartmoor by an old white-headed man, speaking a broad, north-country dialect, with a—"Tha art a polytikle prisoner, I believe?" I replied that such was the nature of the charge that had been made against me. "So am I, and I am verra weel pleased as we con toke together," was the rejoinder of my new acquaintance. I was soon placed in possession of the old man's history, and was agreeably surprised to find behind a strong provincialism of speech and manner an intelligence and a knowledge of political history far beyond what is usually found among English working men. Old D——s had been a Chartist in '48, and held to his principles in every political contest that had occurred in his native town down to one of an unusually bitter character which took place at the general election of '68, when he was concerned in an election riot in which some property was destroyed, was arrested, tried, and sentenced to five years' penal servitude. This piece of injustice, as he termed it, soured the old man's feelings against those who had the administration of English law in their hands, and made him cling all the more tenaciously to the principles he had imbibed from the *Northern Star* and Chartist leaders in the stormy epoch of '48. He was the first intelligent Englishman I had met with who had read Irish history in order to view the Anglo-Irish question from both sides, and who had the liberality to admit and declare that his country had never a valid title to hold Ireland in unwilling political subjection. Whatever other

claim to its possession might be put forward by Englishmen, he would declare, could not stand the test of common sense or justice in the face of England's manifest failure to govern the people of Ireland in a manner that was beneficial to their social welfare, or conducive to the peace and general good of the two countries. He did not believe in that kind of imperial prestige which was acquired at the expense of justice, and which was built upon a robbed and ruined India or a pauperised and disaffected Ireland. Real imperial greatness consisted in an enfranchised people, free trade in the broadest acceptation of the term, just laws and their impartial administration, free public education, and the eradicating of poverty by the readjustment of the land laws, so as to distribute the land as much as possible. He was ashamed of the crimes that had been perpetrated in the name of England upon the people of Ireland, and for his part he would sanction a political separation of the two countries to-morrow, and wish prosperity and happiness to an Irish republic!

I could not help expressing my surprise to find an intelligent Englishman holding such extremely liberal views upon England's rule of Ireland, and I ventured to say that very few more advocates of separation would be found among his countrymen. "My dear sir," he answered, "you mistake ignorance for prejudice when you take it for granted that all Englishmen are dead opposed to an independent Ireland. Let them inquire into the way in which that unfortunate country has been ruled by our kings and parliaments, in the name of Englishmen, and they will arrive at the conclusion which has been forced upon me by the study of Irish history. What guide have they to the formation of a just and impartial opinion in those of our English historians who have written upon the connection of the two countries? None whatever. Give them your side of the question, and rely upon it that justice will be done. Englishmen are not afraid to do right when they once learn that they have been ignorantly in the wrong." Such, divested of their

northern dialect, were the opinions which old D——s invariably put forward as expressive of his views upon the vexed subject of his country's government of Ireland, and I had no reason whatever to suspect them to be anything else but the just and honest convictions of a fair-minded, inquiring Englishman. The old man delighted in recounting his conversations with Fergus O'Connor, who was extremely popular in mid-Yorkshire, and was fond of boasting that he had once shaken hands with O'Connell. He could recite the whole of Robert Emmet's speech from the dock, and I was agreeably surprised to hear him declare that the likeness of this, the purest type of Irish political martyr, could be found in hundreds of farm-houses throughout what D——s was pleased to call "democratic Yorkshire."

These facts, joined to the old man's extensive reading and amount of general information, rendered him a very interesting and acceptable companion under the circumstances, and I always looked forward to a half hour's exercise in his company with a great deal of pleasure. Unfortunately for his peace of mind he was possessed of two of the worst attributes that a man could bring with him into prison and the society of thieves—a bad temper, and a constant habit of boasting that he was an honest man. The first of these incumbrances involved poor D——s in constant trivial breaches of the prison rules, for which he had, of course, to suffer the prescribed penalty; while the other invited a far more unbearable species of annoyance from the thievocracy. To get along well with the latter in prison it is not at all necessary that a non-professional should either advocate or condone the calling of a burglar or pickpocket, or even refrain from passing sentence upon thieving in general. But to expect a thief who is undergoing the same punishment as his critic, and who is placed upon an equal footing with him in regard to law and prison discipline, to listen patiently and submit to a comparison between honesty and dishonesty as represented by

two men in convict dress, would be as ridiculous as to expect a fish-woman having herrings of a questionable freshness to be silent while another would be lauding apparently similar goods at the expense of her own. Old D——s had never viewed the character of his prison associates in this light, but thought it a duty due to his own moral integrity to draw a contrast between that and its obliquity in others whenever he would be placed in exercising file with any pickpocket, and as a natural consequence was disliked and persecuted by most of those with whom he was in daily contact.

Our party was employed in stone-breaking one beautiful June morning, in a portion of the prison-yard where we could command a pleasing view of the Devonshire hills as they roll away from Dartmoor in the direction of Exeter. D——s and I, while cracking our granite, were endeavouring to recall some portion of Yorkshire scenery that would favourably compare with what was stretched before us, clothed in the bright verdure of the season, and laughing under the genial influence of the summer's sun. From scenery to politics, and from Dartmoor to Ireland, were easy conversational transitions under the circumstances, and D——s waxed more than ever indignantly eloquent and vehemently just at the expense of his country's past misdeeds and present culpability in reference to its treatment of "the sister country." "Justice must be done though the heavens should fall. The time was fast approaching when *the people* of England would be enlightened enough, and the franchise extended enough, to enable them to think and act for themselves, and to make some atonement for the crimes of the past by allowing the Irish to select what form of government might best conform to their national feelings and social requirements. The only prejudice that an educated English nation would probably cling to the longest was that against the creed of the Irish people; but though he (D——s) was opposed to all priestcraft, the religion of a people was their own concern, and should not

weigh against the rendering of political justice to them. Macaulay was censurable for the bitterness with which he assailed both the Irish and their national faith; but his teaching would have little effect upon the judgment of the rising generation of his countrymen, who would be guided by pure reason and a love of justice in their dealings with Ireland," &c., &c. Thus did the old man hold out upon the future policy of England, and the bright destiny in store for the land of Fergus O'Connor and Emmet, which would follow from the awakening sense of right and duty of the New England that popular education was now developing so rapidly. But alas! for the Isle of Destiny, and the realisation of D——s' dream of an Irish Republic established by English love of justice! The evil genius of Ireland, that has so often marred the efforts that might deliver her, was again at hand, to dash the hopes and prospects of her liberty to earth once more. This evil genius has appeared under divers circumstances and forms throughout the long and dark period of seven centuries. At one time it is dissension among Irish chieftains; at another it is want of true patriotic courage in the leaders of an armed volunteer force in face of a helpless alien garrison; next it is a storm that scatters a fleet in Bantry Bay; then the deadly blight of treason blasting the hopes of the brave when thinking of victory and freedom; and in the instance I am now relating this evil genius had clothed itself in the personality of a London pickpocket, by name "Mick the Spaniard." Unfortunately for D——s' English-made Irish Republic this wretch was not from the land of El Caballero della Trieste Figuera, but was supposed from his abbreviated Christian name to hail from quite another part of the world, while in reality he was a born Cockney, who was known among his professional associates by the above double misnomer for some reason or other of which history must remain ignorant. He is the same individual who "chucked the dummy," as related in a former lecture and was, of all the

books I ever met in prison, the very incarnation of theft and mischief. During the foregoing conversations between old D——s and myself, “the Spaniard” occupied the seat on my left, and was an eager listener to all that was said upon Anglo-Irish politics; but never a word said he. D——s and he had encountered each other upon more than one occasion, when the old subject of honesty *versus* thieving was thrashed out; “Mick,” of course, not only calling the old man’s profession of that virtue into question, but affirming that no such article was to be found anywhere in society, and that thieving was man’s natural vocation. Of all the enemies which D——s’ defence of honesty had made him among the pickpockets of Dartmoor, “Mick” was the most malignant; and the only barrier between them upon this momentous occasion was the seat occupied by myself.

In the midst of one of D——s’ narratives of Chartist days, I was suddenly called upon by the warder, in company with a few other members of the party, to do some work at the other extremity of the prison yard, which would occupy about an hour in its performance; and, to my regret, neither D——s nor “Mick” were included in the sub-party, as I was not without fears that the old man would fare badly in close quarters with such a character as now sat beside him. On my return from the temporary occupation just referred to, the first object which attracted my attention was a prodigious heap of broken stones in front of old D——s, while his hammer was scattering splinters of granite in every direction, indicating the presence of some unusual excitement as being responsible for this extraordinary manual exertion. On resuming my place between “Mick” and D——s, I observed the tears rolling down the old man’s cheeks, and I guessed at once that an encounter had taken place, in which the young ruffian had grievously hurt the feelings of his companion. When upon the point of inquiring what had happened, I was interrupted by old D——s (who had apparently taken no notice of my return) muttering audibly,

while his hammer was still going as if driven by steam, "I war olus tow'd so, bud couldn't believe id. Neea, I foind id's bud too thru! Macaulay is reet, afther 'all: they are nowt bud a people as is fit fur priestcraft or slavery!" "Why, D——s," I broke in, "what is the matter?" "I've stud up for 'em," he continued, without deigning to notice my question, "monny a hundred toimes against my own countryfolk; bud I shall never do so again—never! They are nod deserving on't." "Oh, come, D——s, old fellow, what *has* caused all this excitement?" I again asked. "Id's this!" he fiercely retorted; "I shall never oppen me meeath again fur th' Irish people. They're being treated just as they desarve, and I shall not only never advocate a separation fra England ony moor, bud I'll tek up arms, if needs be, to prevent it! Owd Oliver's gred mistake ware in nod driving 'em all into t' sea." "But what has *caused* all this, D——s?" I asked again. "*Why, that red-yeded Irish thief there*" (pointing to "Mick") "*has spit i' me face!*" he hurled out with increased vehemence, and then resumed his hostile muttering against the hapless people from whom some one, in an evil hour, had borrowed part of a nickname for the cause of the old man's wrath. Upon demanding an explanation from "Mick," that gentleman coolly informed me that he had attempted to occupy my seat while I was away, whereupon D——s interferred, saying that he did not want any Irish thief near him, "and as I would be reported if I gave him a punch in the nose, I spit in his face, as I am not going to stand cheek from an old gowk of a Yorkshire swine like him," was the reply of the evil genius who had caused an Irish Republic to lose an enthusiastic English advocate.

I do not desire you to believe that *all* Englishmen who call themselves Radicals and friends of Ireland have sympathies and convictions towards that unfortunate country as easily uprooted as those of old D——s. No—not all.

PART II.

SOCIAL EVILS AND SUGGESTED REMEDIES. ·

IN the preceding twenty lectures we have travelled over the first portion of our task. In many respects it has not been an agreeable one, I admit. The dark side of human nature is neither an interesting nor a consolatory study. So fond are we of admiring the good and the beautiful in humanity, that we are only too prone to ignore the existence of its bad and repulsive features until they obtrude themselves upon us in a manner that is anything but complimentary to our self-complacent civilisation. Crimes, criminals, and prisons are phases of our social life which few people, beyond judges, police officials, and jailers, care to trouble their minds about. This is all the worse for the society which engenders such indifference; for the more this criminal skeleton in the cupboard of our modern civilisation is revealed in all its reproaching realism, the sooner will such means be discovered as will either reduce its hideous proportions or succeed in circumscribing its opportunities for evil.

We have, so far, dealt with numerous kinds of crime, and have photographed various types of criminal; but, as yet, we have done no more than hint at such remedies as we shall be expected to propose in the task of minimising criminal propensities and pursuits in the individual, and increasing the methods of deterrence in the state.

I might now attempt to outline these remedies; but before doing so it may be well to deal more specifically with the subject of penal servitude, or the punishment which the rulers of English society inflict upon those who war against their laws. This can best be done by my giving you a short summary of this system, and then offering such comments and suggestions thereon as appear to me to be just, necessary, and feasible.

LECTURE XXI.

THE PUNISHMENT OF PENAL SERVITUDE.

Brief description of Penal Servitude by Lord Kimberley's Royal Commission—Disciplinary Classification of Convicts—Evils of and Remedies for Present System—"Solitary" in its Relation to Deterreny—Penal Colonies—Re-Convicted Criminals—Circumstantial Evidence at Fault—Non-Discriminating Discipline—Anomaly in Sentences—Summary of Penal Servitude.

THE following brief description of penal servitude is taken from the Report by the Penal Servitude Acts Commission, 1879 (vol i. pages 14-19) :—

"Excepting the convicts at large on license, and a limited number in Western Australia (the diminishing remnant of the abandoned system of transportation), the male convicts of Great Britain are confined in the prisons of Borstal, Brixton, Chatham (with its subsidiary establishment at Chattenden), Dartmoor, Millbank, Parkhurst, Pentonville, Portland, Portsmouth, Woking, and Wormwood Scrubs. At Millbank and Pentonville convicts undergo a period of separate confinement, and at the other prisons, which are termed 'public works prisons,' they work in association. The new prison still constructing at Wormwood Scrubs, though now used as a public works prison, is intended when completed to replace Millbank (which is to be discontinued) as a prison for the detention of male and female convicts in separate confinement.

"A sentence to penal servitude includes, as regards the male

convicts of Great Britain, three stages—(1) a period of strict separate confinement, (2) a period on public works, (3) a period on license, if remission of any portion of the sentence be earned.

“In accordance with the opinion of the Commission of 1863, the first stage, which is passed at Millbank or Pentonville, extends in all cases over a term of nine months. In this stage convicts work, sleep, and have their meals each in his own cell. They are in the presence of each other in the daily exercise (for one hour a day) and the daily attendance at chapel, but they are then in silent association. The visits to the cells by the governor, the medical officer, the chaplain, and subordinate officers of the prison alone break the silence and solitude of their lives. The convicts are principally employed in tailoring, hammock and bag making, shoemaking, mat making, weaving, and oakum picking. Ignorant or imperfectly educated convicts receive instruction once or twice a week in reading, writing, and arithmetic, and their progress is tested by half-yearly examinations. All, moreover, are supplied with religious and educational books, and with a limited number of works of general literature, which are called ‘library books.’

“After the first nine months convicts are removed to a public works prison, and there enter-upon the second and longest stage of penal discipline. Excepting some invalid and aged convicts at Parkhurst and Woking, who live entirely in association, convicts on public works sleep and have their meals in separate cells, but labour in association; all communication, however, being prohibited beyond what is indispensable for their work.

“The distribution of employments is regulated in part by the requirements of the service, and in part by the physical capacities, skill, and conduct of the prisoners. Building and engineering for the convict service are carried on at all the prisons, and large works, including excavations, brickmaking, and every branch of building are executing by convict labour

for the Admiralty or the War Office, or for both those departments, at Borstal, Chatham, Portland, and Portsmouth. Extensive reclamation of moorland is conducted at Dartmoor, and farming supplies a suitable occupation for prisoners who are unequal to the severest kinds of labour in the open air. The same occupation is pursued at Parkhurst and Woking, to which prisons invalid and weak-minded convicts are sent. Various trades, such as tailoring, shoemaking, carpentering, and blacksmiths' work, are also carried on in all the prisons, and the superior attractiveness of such kinds of labour furnishes an incentive to good conduct.

"Convicts on public works attend chapel daily. But the practice, to which the Commission of 1863 took exception, of giving convicts schooling in hours that would otherwise be devoted to labour has been discontinued, and the schooling now takes place in the evening after working hours. The time, therefore, devoted to instruction, and especially in the summer months, is less in the public works prisons than during the period of separate confinement. The arrangements with respect to the supply of books to prisoners are similar in both these stages of penal servitude.

"Convicts engaged in indoor employments are allowed daily a period of exercise (usually about an hour), and all are allowed, according to their class, one or more periods of exercise on Sundays. Formerly they took this exercise in groups of twos or threes, but recently the practice of exercise in single file has been introduced as regards male convicts.

"Under the present system of classification, which was adopted in 1864, there are five classes in ascending scale, viz., the probation, the third, the second, the first, and the special classes. Promotion from a lower to a higher class is gained by good conduct and industry; subject, however, to the conditions that the minimum period passed in each of the probation, the third, and the second classes must be one year; that no convict

can be admitted into the first class until he can read or write, unless exemption from this condition be granted by a director; and that the special class cannot be entered without exemplary conduct in the first class, and until within twelve months of discharge from prison. Each class has its own distinctive marks of dress; and promotion in class brings an increase of privileges as regards frequency of communication with friends by letters and by visits, in the amount of exercise on Sundays, and in the rate of gratuity which may be earned. With slight exceptions affecting the second, first, and special classes, all dietary privileges have been abolished since 1864.

"The regulations now in force as to marks and gratuities date from the same year. The Commission of 1863 condemned the then existing system of marks as needlessly complicated, and as having the fault of assuming that the remission would be granted unless it were forfeited in whole or part as a penalty, instead of holding it out as a reward to be earned by good conduct and industry. They were of opinion that credit should not be given for general good conduct, as well as for industry, good conduct in prison (apart from industry) being merely abstinence from misconduct. They also thought that convicts should not be able to earn marks in separate confinement, and they advocated the adoption of such a system as would provide a daily record of each prisoner's industry.

"These requirements of the Commission have been met. No marks can now be earned by good conduct alone, nor apart from good conduct can they be earned by industry. Forfeiture of marks, involving prolonged detention in a lower class or curtailment of the period on license, or both these penalties, at the discretion of the director or governor by whom the convict's offence is judged, is the most common of prison punishments. No marks can be earned during separate confinement, but marks may be prospectively forfeited by misconduct during that period.

"By the existing scale eight marks per diem are allowed for

steady hard labour and the full performance of the allotted task, seven marks for a less degree of industry, and six for a fair but moderate day's work. No remission being granted in the period of separate confinement, a convict on public works daily obtaining eight marks earns the maximum amount of remission, viz., one fourth of so much of the term of his sentence as is spent on public works; while the convict who never obtains more than six marks per diem earns no remission, and therefore serves the entire term of his sentence in prison. Convicts in the light labour classes are credited with only six or seven marks per diem, according to their character and industry, unless the labour be regarded as skilled labour, in which case full marks may be earned. Convicts in hospital are not credited with more than six marks per diem, except by special permission of a director. On Sunday marks are granted for conduct alone at the rate at which the prisoner has earned them during the working days of the week. The marks are daily awarded and recorded by the warders in charge of the working parties, and the governors and deputy governors of the prisons are enjoined to see that this duty is fairly and efficiently performed. Every convict is supplied with a card, which records the number of marks and the amount of gratuity that he may have gained or lost in each quarter.

“The Commission of 1863 disapproved the large gratuities then given to convicts, as having the effect of rendering penal servitude in some rare cases an object of desire rather than of apprehension, and as having the further serious fault of enabling those whose sentences were the longest, and whose crimes were therefore presumably the gravest, to earn the largest sums of money. These evils were remedied by the changes made in 1864. The amount of gratuity which may now be earned is dependent upon the prisoner's class. But convicts in the first class cannot earn a larger gratuity than 3*l.*, and those who reach the special class and place themselves under a Prisoners' Aid

Society may earn an extra gratuity of 3*l.*, making in all 6*l.* An instalment of the gratuity earned is paid to the prisoner at the time of his discharge, and the residue is subsequently remitted to him through the agency of the police of the district where he has gone to reside, or of a Prisoners' Aid Society if he has chosen to accept their assistance. To convicts whose conduct has been bad and who have earned no gratuity a sum of 10*s.* is usually given on discharge."

The foregoing statement is but a bare and colourless description of penal servitude, as it has presented itself to the members of a Royal Commission, from the standpoint of an official inquiry. You will readily admit that it must necessarily assume quite another complexion when considered from the point of view of a many years' actual experience of its punishment. It is from this "fulness of knowledge" I shall speak of it in the present lecture. But I may at once remark that it is not my intention to harrow your feelings with a tale of personal suffering. Such a narrative does not come within the scope of these lectures; and in any case it would be doubly painful to obtrude one's own bitter experiences when criticising defective systems and searching out the best remedies for general social evils.

(The following lecture was mostly contributed as a paper to the *Contemporary Review* for August 1883, and is inserted here by the kind permission of the editor. It was originally mainly copied from my Portland notes.)

I propose in this lecture to point out such defects in this system as appear susceptible of amendment, and to offer a few suggestions on the correlative subject of criminal reformation such as my experience of convict life and observation of criminal character enable me to make. I do not intend to enter into an examination of the management of convict prisons, as my immediate object is to discuss the more important topic of the

penalties awarded to criminals, and the extent to which their infliction deters from the commission of crime, or reforms from evil habits.

Classification of Convicts.—How far the recommendations that were made in the Report of the recent Commission which was appointed to investigate the working of the Penal Servitude Acts, have been carried out by the directors of Convict Prisons, is not easy for the public to fully ascertain. The general election of 1880 and the subsequent absorbing events have put the punishment of criminals and the management of convict prisons in the background of public questions; and prison officials are not over-communicative when popular interest is not excited in connection with their department of the Civil Service. The way in which the prisons of the country are administered, and the methods by which the criminal classes are punished and sought to be reformed, will, however, continue to be a study of interest so long as the prevention of crime remains a problem of modern civilisation.

Lord Kimberley's Commission recommended the separation of convicts against whom no previous conviction is recorded from those who are habitual offenders, by forming them into a distinct class. This, if fully carried out, would be reform in the right direction; but it does not propose to effect such a complete dissociation of casual from hardened criminals as will minimise the evils of contamination and weaken habits and influences that tend to confirm criminal propensities. Of the number of convicts undergoing sentences of penal servitude, not more than 5 per cent. have ever been in prison before. In what manner it was intended by Lord Kimberley's Commission that these five hundred or more "Star" convicts, should be formed into a separate class, is not specified in the wording of the recommendation just referred to. Distributed over the various convict prisons, this "Star" class would give about fifty or sixty to each establishment, and unless they are em-

ployed apart, as well as located apart, from all the other inmates of each prison, the proposal of the Commission would not be fully carried out, if I rightly apprehend its spirit and object.

To explain the plan of "classification" that is followed in the convict system, as now administered by the Board of Directors, will probably be the best way of drawing attention to the need for a further extension of the reform which was the first of the eleven chief recommendations contained in the Report of the recent Penal Servitude Acts Commission.

All convicts are classed according to the time which they have served out under their respective sentences, and not, as is generally supposed, according to the nature of the crime for which they are convicted, the number of previous convictions, or the duration of sentences. A murderer, a forger, a bigamist, a pickpocket, a burglar, and an issuer of counterfeit coin, if tried and sentenced at the same assize, might all pass together through the five stages of penal servitude—"Probation," "third," "second," "first," and "special" classes. Assuming that they would be equal in their obedience to disciplinary regulations, no distinction whatever would be drawn between them after that made by the judge in awarding to each different terms of penal servitude.

Every convict upon entering "Probation class" (first stage after sentence) is given a register number and "letter" by which he is to be subsequently known—the letter denoting the year of conviction. Prisoners sentenced in the year 1874, for instance, have the letter "A" on the sleeve of the jacket; those in 1875 "B," 1876 "C," &c.; while those whose trials have occurred anterior to 1874 are lettered in the reverse order, *e.g.* 1873 "Z," 1872 "Y," 1871 "X," &c. Re-convicted men wear two or more letters, representing the years in which their sentences were passed: thus "W" "G" would mean a first conviction in 1870, and a second in 1880.

This plan of "classification" is really no classification at all; or, at least, it bears about the same relation to what is the obvious meaning of the term, when applied to a discriminating separation of criminals undergoing punishment in a convict prison, as would the "playing at soldiers" of a band of children to the regular daily drill and military efficiency of a company of the line. Fifty convicts, sentenced, say, last year, will, upon reaching Dartmoor, Portland, or Portsmouth prisons this year, be located according to their badge-letters, if there should happen to be accommodation in those wards in which prisoners are usually required to pass the second year of their sentence; but while at daily work these fifty new convicts will be distributed among the sixty or eighty labour-gangs into which the inmates of each of these prisons are divided, irrespective of any distinction whatever of crime, duration of sentence, number of previous convictions, or length of sentence worked out.

I fail to see any insuperable difficulty, so far as the management of convict prisons is concerned, in the way of extending the classification proposed by Lord Kimberley's Commission to the daily work of convicts, as well as to their location in what are supposed to be separate wards. This would effectively prevent all contact between hardened criminals and those less infected with moral disease.

A further separation, regulated on something like a classification of offences, would still more narrow the sphere of contamination, and afford full play to whatever deterrent influence the punishment of penal servitude exercises upon the minds of criminals. The force of example is more powerful where there is no moral check upon vicious acts. I have known convicts, not belonging to the thieving classes, become experts in stealing other prisoners' food from observing the way in which skilled pickpockets could abstract loaves from the ward bread-basket, or rifle the cell of a next-door neighbour. The certainty of

punishment deters from such acts only in proportion to the thief's belief as to his chances of detection.

I have known some of those perverted beings whose particular walk in crime will only bear hinting at, to monopolise the surreptitious conversation of their immediate surroundings in the work-gang by day and of the ward in which they were located by night. Most of the cells in the public-works prisons are made of corrugated iron, and they offer as great a facility for conversation, when the habits of the warder, or the night-guard in charge, are understood, as if no partition existed between the several sleeping apartments. Men convicted for unnatural crimes are not very numerous, it is true, but they should be confined in other than corrugated iron cells by night, and be employed by day apart from all other prisoners.

The thieving class—pickpockets, burglars, and swindlers—should also be located by themselves, and be debarred from association in daily labour with those prisoners whose offences do not imply a confirmed disposition in the individual to prey upon society. A further division of this, the most numerous, class of criminal into young and old offenders, both in respect to location and employment, should likewise, for obvious reasons, be effected in each convict prison.

“Solitary.”—How far the practice of separate confinement should be carried in the punishment and reformation of criminals is a subject upon which more has been written, *pro* and *con*, than on any other phase of penal discipline. The experience of one man can be no test of how solitary confinement affects another; as its influence, for good or evil, must be as various as the temperaments of those subjected to it. It is a subject upon which theory will decide nothing. The only test of its worth, as a reformatory agency particularly, is that of experience; and few who have actually acquired this knowledge care to come before the public with their opinions. Those who are next best qualified to speak on the matter are, of course, governors and

chaplains of convict prisons; but the opinions of these latter authorities are liable to be influenced by their respective callings:—governors will shape their views in accordance with the trouble or facility which separate confinement affords them in maintaining the discipline of their prisons, rather than from its observed effect upon the health or moral character of their prisoners; while prison chaplains, as a rule, value this kind of treatment solely for the opportunities which it offers for imparting religious instruction. I may remark again that the apparently devout “chaplains’ and priests’ men”—as “religious” prisoners are termed—are *generally* the most hardened criminals, experienced, calculating thieves, and diplomatic swindlers who are too wary to quarrel with the prison rules, and too accustomed to the practice of deception to refrain from imposing, as far as possible, upon priest and minister. Separate confinement has no reformatory effect whatever upon this class of criminal, though it exercises a certain, but by no means considerable, punitive one.

My observation of the effect which separate confinement has upon all criminals—accidental, casual, and hardened—leads me to the conclusion, that if the nine months “solitary” in the initial stage of the sentence were changed to six months then and six more at the terminal portion, it would exercise a more deterrent effect than under the existing arrangement. The one thing most dreaded by the old jail-bird is work requiring bodily exertion. His fingers become as trained, by practice, in picking oakum when in prison, as in picking pockets or locks when out; and as this is the usual task that has to be performed during solitary confinement, it has no terrors equal to what a barrow or a shovel on public works has for one who hates “hard graft” next to the wages of idleness—bread and water. To be exempted from hard labour is the one object which occupies every mental resource of experienced criminals from the time of sentence until the medical inspection in Millbank or Pentonville shall determine what is to be the class of labour in which the

remainder of the sentence is to be passed. It is during "solitary" the plans are laid by which the doctor is to be persuaded that hard labour can only be performed at the risk of certain death; and it is in this stage, likewise, that malingering and kindred practices are most resorted to in hopes of qualifying for an invalid prison. Such of the regular criminal class as are physically able for the performance of hard labour should be transferred as soon as possible after conviction to the public-works prisons, to be put to the work which is really more healthful for them than sedentary labour, but which is, at the same time, more distasteful, and, of all the punishments comprised in penal servitude, is the one best calculated to deter them from incurring the risk of its re-in infliction.

On the other hand, such convicts as have some record of having worked for a living at one period or another of their lives, dread separate confinement more than the tasks on public works; and as this is the class of prisoners most susceptible of reformation, the kind of treatment to which they are subjected deserves more serious attention than that of the habitual offender. I am no believer in separate confinement as a sovereign remedy for criminal reformation. If it saves some prisoners from contact with more hardened criminals, it is open to the objection of inducing mental and bodily diseases in men who are not hopelessly given over to crime. Under conditions that would lessen the evils just referred to, separate confinement might become a reformatory kind of punishment instead of being, what it now is, a portion of the partially deterrent system so elaborately organised by Sir E. F. Du Cane. More rewards, in better food and increased gratuities, for work and exemplary conduct, greater attention on the part of schoolmasters, chaplains, and superior prison officials, with increased privileges in the way of keeping up home influences—such as letters and visits—together with shorter sentences all worked out, would undoubtedly render separate confinement a means of reforming a

large number of criminals whose better nature under the kind of penal servitude now inflicted is not only completely ignored, but mechanically reduced to the uniform level of Sir E. F. Du Cane's standing army of 10,000 habitual offenders. Such a sweeping reform, however, as one that would substitute shorter terms of punishment passed in improved "solitary" for first convictions, in place of those now inflicted, is more likely to be looked upon as a kind of penal millennium than to be deemed practicable by the military men into whose hands the administration of prisons has completely passed, and by whose expensive management each convict is made to cost the public over thirty pounds a year.

Separate confinement at the end of a sentence of penal servitude for "Star" and young convicts would give fuller scope to the deterrent influence of that kind of punishment than it now possesses. It would weaken the effects of the association with other criminals during the working out of the sentence, and enable the reformatory agencies of chaplain and schoolmaster to better prepare the prisoner for the world into which he would go direct from their teachings.

Hardened criminals, subject to the classification recommended, with, of course, sufficient healthy food, should be kept at such bodily labour as they are fit to perform from sentence until discharge. Could another penal colony be founded for this type of criminal it would be a blessing to himself and a boon to society to send him there. In England he will but continue to move in a circle of crime and imprisonment. Change of surroundings develops change of disposition in individuals. Admitting the evils that were associated with the penal settlement in Australia, it cannot be denied but that it rendered material service alike to the colonists and to the transported convicts, many of whom were reclaimed under the new conditions of existence. I have spoken on this subject of a revival of transportation with large numbers of men who are put down as

confirmed criminals, but whom I believe to be only conditionally so; and they have invariably declared they would stand a chance of getting along in life, independently of crime, if removed from the haunts and influences which fix their careers at home, and from the society that repels them. Chance for moral retrieval in England there is none. The stigma of penal servitude is not more lasting than is the professional prejudice of the detective police against "a convict at large," or one who is known to these emissaries of the law to have once been convicted of theft. Philanthropic police administrators lead the public to believe in the existence of a London police that neither annoy discharged convicts nor prevent them from gaining an honest livelihood. I am not going to call into question the sincerity of their motives; but if these officials could personally supervise the action of each detective policeman, or indoctrinate their subordinates generally with their own humane opinions, they would only then be in a position to give such an assurance to the public. As well suppose a trained dog capable of refraining from pursuing game as expect men who obtain their living by tracking, and earn promotion by efficiency in detecting, criminals, to look with any feeling of compassion upon "a known thief" after his liberation from prison. To watch discharged convicts is the sole duty of select detective officers, and this surveillance alone, if its performance could be freed from the prejudice of the force against those whom they believe belong to the confirmed criminal class, would necessitate the disclosure of the antecedents of an ex-convict to whoever might be induced, through ignorance of the same, to give him employment of any trust. I do not say that the detective police, as a body, systematically prevent discharged prisoners from gaining an honest livelihood; but I assert that it is absurd to suppose that they are more considerate of the interests of the man whom they are trained to look upon as a confirmed criminal than of those of an employer of labour, who, they naturally

enough believe, runs the risk of being victimised unless warned of the record of the ex-jail-bird who may have succeeded in entering his employment. The re-conviction of such a large number of criminals proves either their unwillingness or their inability to earn an honest living, and sound sense demands the creation of some scheme whereby their course of life, made up of theft and punishment in England, should be diverted into a sphere of existence less harmful to society and themselves. A penal colony appears to me the only remedy for confirmed criminals that will combine a regard for public interests with the dictates of common humanity.

Re-Convicted Criminals.—It is not just to rank all those as habitually criminal who have two sentences of penal servitude recorded against them. A first conviction may have been brought about through acts prompted by motives that are not criminal, such as the pressure of want, or other similar extenuating incentives to a transgression of the law; while the fallibility of circumstantial and the unconscious bias of interested evidence may reasonably be supposed to be responsible for a large percentage of the numerous convictions that are obtained on the testimony of members of a police organisation in which there is, naturally enough, engendered a belief in the guilt of every one arrested who cannot prove him or her self perfectly innocent of a charge resting upon suspicion.

Allowing for the existence of a large number of prisoners who asseverate their innocence of the crimes of which they have been clearly proved to be guilty, there must, nevertheless, be cases in which the machinery of the law, sharing the imperfections of human nature, will have been the only offender against justice. One of many such instances that came under my notice while confined in Dartmoor Convict Prison, will illustrate the terrible wrong which has been not unfrequently inflicted upon men who have once fallen beneath the ban of the law and the subsequent surveillance of the police.

Two convicts, named O'Brien and Bentley, were occasional work-companions of mine, during my stay in that prison, the one having been condemned to fourteen and the other to twenty years' penal servitude, and Bentley being a "second-timer" or re-convicted prisoner. A very strong antipathy that manifested itself between them led me to inquire into its origin, whereupon I discovered that Bentley had been convicted for a burglary of a most daring character that had been committed in London by O'Brien, previous to and independent of the crime for which the latter had been sentenced to fourteen years. The police had failed to trace the deed to the actual perpetrator. Unfortunately for Bentley he was found loitering near the scene of the transaction, and, having a previous conviction against him, he was awarded twenty years' penal servitude—twelve of which he had already served when the foregoing facts were elicited by me, not from Bentley alone, but from O'Brien, the actual author of the crime, and from other prisoners also, who were fully conversant with the whole story of the burglary.

It is among "third-" and "fourth-timers," having an additional record of imprisonment in county jails, that the really hardened and irreclaimable type of thief and accomplished swindler is to be found—men whom nothing but the knowledge that they are known to and constantly dogged by the agents of the law will deter from attempting, at all times, the gratification of their desire for whatever in the possession of others may chance to excite it.

Non-Discriminating Discipline.—The discipline of convict prisons has been regulated by what is necessary to maintain the most insubordinate prisoner in constant subjection, and not by a standard of what is required to keep in order, and measure out a just and reasonable daily punishment to, the average type of fairly-conducted prisoner. This is a principle that may have suggested to those who legislate for Ireland the idea of imposing a penalty by way of tax upon any district in which an

individual has committed some outrage. The result must necessarily be the same in each case. A penalty imposed upon a community for acts for which they are not collectively responsible is certain to breed more of discontent towards the power that inflicts it than resentment against the person alone morally and justly blamable in the transaction. A prisoner in Dartmoor was one day discovered with a piece of iron concealed beneath his vest, whereupon an order was immediately put in force compelling *all* prisoners to bare their chests to the shirt, in future, on each of the four occasions, daily, when searching on parade took place. When the dampness of the climate of Dartmoor is borne in mind—the rainfall averaging more than 100 inches in the year—it can easily be seen how much additional punishment was thus unmeritedly inflicted upon a thousand convicts for an act committed by one; and how coughs and colds would necessarily be multiplied through this needless additional stripping in the open air.

Again, evidence is given before the Royal Commission on the Working of the Penal Servitude Acts that the conversation of a certain class of criminal is corrupting to other prisoners, and forthwith we have *all* conversation prohibited to *all* convicts, from the day of their sentence to that of liberation; though upon what authority, beyond that of Sir E. Du Cane, this most drastic regulation has been put in force is not easy to determine, as it is not included in the recommendations contained in the Report of Lord Kimberley and his colleagues, nor authorised, so far as I am aware, by any specific parliamentary enactment.

In this prison of Portland, containing an average of sixteen hundred convicts, penal discipline is probably more rigidly carried out than in any other similar establishment in the world. Yet, notwithstanding the daily ordeal of this punishment—its merciless disregard of human passion and feeling, its exaction of implicit obedience to humiliating, minute, and ceaseless regulations which are calculated to keep in sleepless activity

every incentive to rebellion of which the human mind is capable under the keenest provocation that could possibly be devised, short of systematic torture—there are *eight hundred criminals against whom there is not a single scratch of a pen* (to use the language of Governor Clifton) *from year to year!* Four hundred more are put down as “good-conducted prisoners,” whose casual breaches of the rules are of a trivial character; while an additional two hundred are classed as “fairly conducted” men, who are seldom reported for any act of insubordination requiring the intervention of the visiting director. If such a marvellous command of temper and exercise of obedience as are thus displayed by men whose misfortunes in life are attributable to want of moral self-control in society, could be equalled by righteous men in religious adversity, Job would be surpassed as an exemplar of patience, and half the saints would, in comparison, be deemed unworthy of the calendar. Still, these men, so tried and so exemplary, are subjected to the same discipline, undergo the same degree of labour-punishment daily, and are placed in almost every respect on an exact par with the remaining two hundred more or less reckless prisoners, whose insubordinate dispositions determine the daily regulations and penalties to which all convicts are subjected.

Sentences.—When we think of the enormous wealth that is constantly displayed in London and other large cities to the curious gaze of hundreds of thousands of destitute men, women, and children—creatures who are strangers to the ordinary comforts of life, and for whom the sight of surrounding luxuries must be a kindred torture to that of Tantalus—it is surprising that fifty times more theft is not attempted, and that the criminal class is not far more numerous in Great Britain than we find it to be. It is in connection with these temptations that are exhibited to indigence and vice, often so carelessly, and, as a rule, so needlessly, by the possessors of wealth, that I would direct attention to the unreasonable, if not vindictive, severity

of the law in dealing with a class of human beings for whose Ishmaelite propensities society itself is, in the main, responsible. Doubtless human nature has a conception of some moral obligation, or human ideas of right and wrong would not have formed a basis for codes of equity and morals in society. But such a conception, if not nursed and cultivated in the individual by external influences, will no more fructify into correct notions of duty to man and society than would the most fruitful soil spontaneously offer us the necessaries of life without the hand of labour or the skill of the husbandman supplying the media by which Nature is delivered of her gifts to mankind. Given, therefore, a percentage of the population of Great Britain upon whom poverty and ignorance are allowed to exercise their demoralising influence, and upon whose perverted lives the accessory evils of intemperance and the solicitations of ostentatious wealth are permitted to have full play, how can the society that is responsible for such a state of things sanction the sentences that are now passed upon criminals who have been thus nurtured by its own neglect, and for crimes which are mainly the outcome of its own defective police organisation?

If it is not denied that even a criminal has a right to know, before transgressing the law, what is to be the penalty he is to incur if found guilty of crime, is it not equally just to say that those who have received no moral training—the waifs and strays of populous cities, from whom the criminal class is chiefly recruited—are not cognisant of the moral obliquity of the acts for which they receive such enormously disproportionate sentences? Are not the incentives to crime more powerful and numerous than the preventives, say, in London, Glasgow, Liverpool, Manchester, and Birmingham—cities that contribute more than fifty per cent. to the criminal population of Great Britain? Yet those who are permitted to graduate in criminal pursuits under the tuition of the low drinkhouse and the brothel, and to be subject to the demoralisation of crowded and ill-

ventilated dwellings in the slums of cities and towns, are dealt with by the administrators of the law as if they were offending against a society that had done its utmost to remove the nurseries of social disease which breed the convict population of Portland and its kindred establishments. Attention has often been called to the anomalous custom of apportioning the duration of sentences to criminals, by which periods of five, seven, ten, fifteen, twenty years and life are awarded, while penalties comprising intermediate terms are scarcely ever inflicted; though it would be ridiculous to suppose that intermediate terms would not afford adequate punishment. If regard for the prison accommodation of a growing criminal class, and for the expenditure which their costly system of punishment entails upon the public, induces public writers to ventilate in the press the question of shorter sentences, it may be permissible to add to such arguments the higher ones of simple justice and equity, which are enforced by the above considerations.

The recent Commission for Inquiring into the Working of the Penal Servitude Acts has recommended the repeal of that provision in the Penal Servitude Act of 1864, by which, in case where any person is convicted of any offence punishable with penal servitude after having been previously convicted of felony, the least sentence of penal servitude that can be awarded is a period of seven years. This recommendation is both just and humane. Why, then, can there not be discovered a virtue of punishment in terms of four, six, eight, nine, eleven, twelve, sixteen and eighteen years respectively, as well as in "the favourite periods" of five, seven, ten, fifteen and twenty? It is absurdly unjust to proceed upon the theory that because ten years is deemed by a judge to be insufficient punishment for an offence which does not merit fourteen, there is therefore no intermediate figure that could satisfy the ends of justice.

Quality of Punishment.—It could be nowise derogatory to the functions of those whose occupation it is to pass sentence

upon criminals to pay periodical visits to the various convict establishments, in order to obtain a fuller insight into what penal discipline really is, and what is the true nature of the punishment that is awarded in a sentence of five, ten, or fifteen years of convict slavery. Such knowledge would be easily purchased if it disclosed to judicial minds the fact that the quality of the punishment to which convicts are subjected is calculated to engender among criminals the feeling that the law has been vindictive where it should only have been just; and that there is inflicted in a five-years' sentence of such a system of purgatorial expiation, as that now perfected by Sir E. F. Du Cane, a penalty far more severe than what is believed by the general public to be comprised in penal servitude.

When prison officials are seen coming forward to advocate—as they occasionally do in the magazines—a non-vindictive policy towards the criminal classes, the public mind is edified by the spectacle of philanthropy being associated with the control of the prisons of the country and the police of London; and he must indeed be an ungrateful tax-payer who will begrudge whatever annual sum is asked from Parliament to maintain in efficiency the systems so administered. If these public servants could infuse their own fairness into every member of the subdivided machinery of their centralised departments, there would no longer be any fear of an unwarranted exercise of deputed authority on the part of subordinates. It must not, however, be overlooked in an estimate of this kind, that it is natural in all responsible officials to persuade themselves, and the public if possible, that a degree of perfection has been reached in their special posts of trust not previously attained therein. The reputation for efficiency of a prominent public officer is too frequently accepted as a guarantee for that of his department. Confidence in the head suggests belief in the soundness of the whole of the machinery supposed to be under his immediate hand. In the administration of centralised civic authority this

is anything but a safe guide to a correct knowledge as to the just and impartial exercise of its duties. Where there is but indirect control in the performance of such duties as those of a prison warder, there cannot be direct supervision, and deputed prison authority is liable to abuse in exact proportion to the relative legal status of the officer and the convict. What, for instance, does the chairman of directors know of the full nature of convict Smith's punishment under the rule of assistant-warder Jones, in the quarries outside our cell or on the bogs of Dartmoor? If Smith reports Jones's petty tyranny to the governor, all that Jones has to do, to evade whatever consequences such treatment might incur, is to deny the truth of the charge, and, according to the evidence of prison governors tendered to Lord Kimberley's Commission, the officer's denial would dispose of the matter. But Smith's injury would not end here, if he were foolish enough to report his officer, even under provocation. The giving of marks to convicts, by which remission of sentence is alone earned, is the duty of warders and assistant-warders, and the stoppage of even two marks for one day, out of a possible daily earning of eight, might entail upon Smith a prolongation of penal servitude for one week.

To inquire into a circumstance of this kind (with hundreds of which I have been familiar during my imprisonment in Dartmoor), Sir E. F. Du Cane would have to receive his information through the various grades of authority interposing between himself and convict Smith; and yet, with this disadvantage, as to a correct knowledge of the real character of the punishment of penal servitude, as carried out by practically irresponsible subordinates, Sir E. F. Du Cane is expected to say whether such a penalty, so inflicted, is calculated to reform or harden the criminal.

Penal servitude has become so elaborated that it is now a huge punishing machine, destitute, through centralised control and responsibility, of discrimination, feeling, or sensitiveness;

and its non-success as a deterrent from crime, and complete failure in reformative effect upon criminal character, are owing to its obvious essential tendency to deal with erring human beings—who are still men despite their crimes—in a manner which mechanically reduces them to a uniform level of disciplined brutes.

There is scarcely a crime possible for man to be guilty of, short of murder, which should not, in strict justice, be expiated by seven years' infliction of a punishment that has been brought to such a nicety of calculation that there is the closest possible surveillance of every one undergoing it night and day, together with an unceasing conflict between every feeling in the prisoner that is superior to a mere condition of animal existence and the everlasting compulsion to refrain from almost all that it is natural for man to do, and to do what it is to the last degree repugnant for any rational being to consent to perform. Yet wretches who have had a London gutter or a workhouse for their only moral training-school, and who have been subsequently nurtured in crime by society's other licensed agencies of moral corruption receive ten, fifteen, and sometimes twenty years for thefts and crimes which should, in justice, be expiated by a twelve months' duration of such punishment. It is these horribly unjust penalties that beget many of the desperadoes of Portland, Chatham, and Dartmoor, the murderers of warders, the malingerers, and the partial maniacs, and which implant in the minds of convicts that ferocious animosity against law and society which turns so many of them into reckless social savages. A chastisement that would punish criminals without keeping in perpetual motion all that is vicious and resentful in human nature, and, while inflicting a merited penalty for proven guilt, should teach a better lesson to erring humanity than despair and revenge, would surely serve the ends of law and justice without impairing the systems of detection and punishment by which society is protected from its enemies.

LECTURE XXII.

EDUCATION AS A PREVENTIVE OF CRIME.

Imaginary Flight from Prison—A Scene *en route*—Confines of London—Crime Germination—Children in Slums and Workhouses—The Remedy—Reformatory Institutions—Combination of the Kindergarten, Elementary Schools, and Manual Instruction—Their Management—The Class of Children to be Rescued—Evidence of the Efficacy of the Kindergarten—An Appalling Fact—Twelve Hundred Paupers, Vagabonds, and Criminals traced for origin to the Children of one Abandoned Woman—The Shelter Schools of France—The Higher Work of Reformatory Institutions.

FIGURATIVELY speaking, we are now about to quit this our involuntary "hermitage." In fancy, we shall breathe the air of liberty and commingle with the busy outside world, as if stone walls did not a prison make, for me, nor iron bars a cage, for you. As yet, you are a complete stranger to civilised life beyond this cell, excepting what little has been revealed of it in the course of our previous lectures. The scenes which we shall witness in our imaginary excursion, will not therefore have that interest for you which they will possess for me.

In our flight of fancy towards the confines of the nearest large city, we shall pass many objects, animate and inanimate, which would point the moral for our lectures; but we shall leave them for a more close observation later on.

But stay, for a moment! Do you see that field in which men and women are bent down working? This is Dorsetshire. These labourers are but earning a few shillings a week for the maintenance of themselves and families. Wonder wretched-

looking huts, which you see disfiguring the landscape, are their homes. Comfort or cleanliness within there is little or none. They are the residences of human beings but little removed from the condition of chattel slavery—men who plod on from year to year in sluggish misery, seemingly indifferent to those causes which tie them down to this animal-like existence——

“Do they own this land?”

Bless you, no. They are the wage servants of the farmers, who are the rent-payers to the landlord, who is the monopolist of this portion of the soil of England.

“Does *he* work?”

Why, yes—in a way. He collects, or causes to be collected, the rent once or twice a year; he hunts, shoots, and fishes over these lands; and, as Justice of the Peace for this locality, he occasionally sends some of these workers whom you see in the fields to the county prison for daring to catch a hare for a Sunday dinner, or lift a trout from that running stream at our feet. He probably goes to Parliament, also, to represent the interests of his class and to defend and perpetuate those laws which enable him and his like to make others do all the work while he and his kind do all the enjoyment of life. Away in that stately residence, whose turrets you see peeping above the trees of that distant demesne, you perceive his country seat, or the place where he spends a few weeks each year when tired of city pleasures.

Look upon that picture and then upon these huts and those toilers in the fields, and say whether the workers and the idler should not, in justice, change residences?

But I am delaying our journey to the nearest large city. Here we are at last! You perceive that we have exchanged the bracing air, the varied landscape and the calm repose of country life, for the smoky atmosphere, the lines of narrow streets, and the noise and jostle of this crowded place. Poverty associated with green fields and fragrant hawthorn is bad enough,

in all truth; but when cooped up in those small and ill-ventilated tenements, which you see rising up on each side of these narrow, dirty slums around us, it is truly a condition of social wretchedness which may well cause you to wonder why life is worth living to the creatures whom you see prowling about.

Look at that group of little children, making mud pies in yonder gutter! You can easily picture what their training will be from the character of these surroundings. This morning, some of them were probably hawked round the outskirts of the city on the arms of professional beggars, for the purpose of exciting the charity of benevolent people. A similar plan will be put into operation to-night, among the drink-shops. If the parents of the children do not themselves resort to this practice, they lend their offspring to other vagabonds who will pay them interest on those human loans out of the alms that will be gathered by their aid.

What will the future of these children be? What can it be but the life of sin and wretchedness which begets those strange beings whose crimes and characters we have been portraying in our previous discourses? They are the criminal seedlings for the next generation of thieves and desperadoes who will people the convict prisons of England.

Let us visit another nursery of poverty and depravity. You see that long, prison-like building, away to the left? That is the workhouse. A workhouse is an institution of licensed idleness for broken-down drunkards and "ne'er-do-weels," and a prison for such honest poverty as will not starve or steal in the midst of abundant but unjustly distributed wealth. It is the symbol of the Community's obligation towards providing its destitute members with that sustenance which will prevent the crime of starvation. It is a just and Christian idea; but like many more beneficent ideas in our social economy, it is vitiated in the application.

There are two classes of inmates here. One is an idle and

immoral class, which occupies a mid position between known criminals and the labouring masses in the economy of society; the other comprises the aged, the wrecked, and the unfortunate belonging to the working orders. Both classes are placed on a footing of equality—they are all paupers. The professional loafer is as well-fed and cared for as the aged or over-worked artisan or labourer. This is not as it ought to be. The man who by years of industry in his native land, no matter how humble the occupation at which he has been employed, has contributed alike to the wealth of the nation and the riches of landlord or capitalist employer, is justly entitled in his old age to be taken care of by the State, without the association of quasi-criminals or the stigma of degrading pauperism. He it is who should really be the pensioner of the nation; at least to the extent of being maintained respectably when he is incapacitated by age or infirmity from providing for himself.

As for the other class, they should be dealt with in the way John Ruskin prescribes :

“ Since for every idle person some one else must be working somewhere to provide him with food and clothes, and doing, therefore, double the quantity of work that would be enough for his own needs, it is only a matter of pure justice to compel the idle person to work for his maintenance himself. The conscription has been used in many countries, to take away labourers who support their families from their useful work, and maintain them for purposes chiefly of military display at the public expense. Since this has been long endured by the most civilised nations, let it not be thought that they would not much more gladly endure a conscription which would seize only the vicious and idle, already living by criminal procedures at the public expense; and which should discipline and educate them to labour which would not only maintain themselves, but be serviceable to the commonwealth. The question is simply

this: We must feed the drunkard, vagabond, and thief; but shall we do so by letting them steal their food, and do no work for it? or shall we give them their food in appointed quantity, and enforce their doing work which shall be worth it; and which, in process of time, will redeem their own characters, and make them happy and serviceable members of society? Your idle people, as they are now, are not merely waste coal-beds. They are explosive coal-beds, which you pay a high annual rent for. You are keeping all these idle persons, remember, at a far greater cost than if they were busy. Do you think a vicious person eats less than an honest one? or that it is cheaper to keep a bad man drunk than a good man sober?"

But we have come to this place to look after the children. Our object is to point out how the pauper and criminal classes can be reduced in society; and we must, therefore, keep the children, rather than the parents, in view. There are probably two or three hundred children of both sexes inside of this one workhouse. A large portion of these are of criminal parentage and have criminal natures. They should be kept apart from those who are not thus inoculated with criminal propensities; but no such classification is adopted here, and thus we see how crime-breeding is ignorantly fostered at the very stage of life when it is most important, both for the good of the child and the welfare of society, to begin the work of reformation. Well, now, it is only natural that I should be asked to submit proposals, such as, in my judgment, would remedy the evils of which I have been speaking. I admit the fairness of the demand, and I gladly respond to it. I entertain very emphatic opinions as to what ought to be done with a view, at least, to minimise the evils of the existing social system. Whether or not these opinions are likely to be considered "practical," remains to be seen. I only affirm that they are sincerely held, and that they have been reached after much earnest thought.

I would take the children of both hardened and casual

criminals from their parents, and unprotected or neglected children from wherever found, and place them in kindergarten, industrial, or reformatory schools, placing all such institutions directly under State supervision and control, aided by ladies and gentlemen resident within reasonable distance. My acquaintance with institutions of this character is not extensive; but it is sufficient to enable me to bear testimony to the nobleness of private efforts in the direction I speak of. I would have the State avail itself of this laudable devotion to the regeneration of the unfortunate, so unstintingly shown by philanthropic citizens throughout Great Britain and Ireland, and largely extend its opportunity of application. I am satisfied that the State could not make too heavy a demand upon the benevolent energies of sympathetic men and women in a work of this kind; and I am equally convinced that the demand, however heavy, ought to be made. If we placed such institutions exclusively under the control of officials, we should but aggravate the admitted evil of officialism pure and simple. But if to the official element we added the voluntary element, we should, in my judgment, obtain a control of the most prudent and yet earnest and enlightened, character. I am well aware that the combination of which I speak already exists to a considerable extent in regard to many public institutions, but it is capable of much improvement and very wide extension.

In all great centres of population, then, I would establish reformatory institutions which should be a combination of the kindergarten, the elementary, the industrial, and the reformatory schools; the aim of these institutions should be both preventive and curative. Beginning with the children of the criminal population, who as yet are too young to be criminal, I would take them away from their present surroundings, and place them in the kindergarten of a reformatory institution. In the next place, I would take the boys and girls who are just entering upon careers of crime, and place these in the higher departments

of the reformatory institutions. To the work of these several departments I will refer later on, after having indicated how I would have them governed. In this matter I would follow the same principle, viz. that of combination. Indeed, I doubt if I have any more brilliant suggestion to make in this connection than this—that I would organise the various agencies for the prevention and cure of crime into one grand national enterprise.

The reformatory institutions—I can at this moment think of no better name—should be, I say, a combination of the methods of government pursued in the institutions whose place they are to take. There should be a Board of Management for each institution, composed of one paid Inspector, ranking with the Chief Inspectors of schools or factories, and appointed by the Home Office, and say twenty or thirty ordinary members of both sexes, nominated by the governing authorities of the towns, cities, or counties interested in any given institution.

The Inspector should be the official member of the Board of Management of perhaps four or five such institutions. His wide experience would be invaluable, and his position would command the respect and consideration of every ordinary member of the Boards with which he would be connected. Let us suppose him the direct representative of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and then let us suppose the action of every Board liable to revision at the hands of that functionary, and we see at once that the official element would be sufficiently represented on all Boards of Management. The business of such Boards, in connection with any institution under their control, would be purely administrative. The Board would appoint the necessary superintendents and subordinate officers of both sexes, who should be responsible to the Board for the proper carrying out of all duties, regulations, and work of the institutions. It would receive all children committed to its charge, and have them watched over with a tenderer care and a more moral solicitude than would be extended to them if left to breathe the

pestilential atmosphere of habitual criminality, or follow in the footsteps of drunken and depraved vagabondage.

What children should be taken into such institutions? and how would you avoid interfering with parental authority in cases where proof of criminal pursuits or evidence of criminal neglect on the part of the parents would not be very clear?

The following conditions, laid down in the Neglected and Criminal Children's Act of the colony of Victoria (Australia), ought, in my opinion, to determine the character of children that should be rescued from crime and vagabondage, and trained in the reformatory institutions:

1. Any child found begging or receiving alms, or being in any street or public place for the purpose of begging or receiving.

2. Any child who shall be found wandering about or frequenting any street, thoroughfare, tavern or place of public resort, or sleeping in the open air, and who shall not have any home or settled place of abode, or any visible means of subsistence.

3. Any child who shall reside in any brothel or associate or dwell with any person known or reputed to be a thief, prostitute, or habitual drunkard, or with any person convicted of vagrancy under any Act now or hereafter to be in force.

4. Any child who, having committed an offence punishable by imprisonment, or some less punishment, ought, nevertheless, in the opinion of the Justices, regard being had to his age and the circumstances of his case, to be sent to an industrial school.

5. Any child whose parent represents that he is unable to control such child, and that he wishes him to be sent to an industrial school, and gives security to the satisfaction of the Justices, before whom such child may be brought for payment of the maintenance of such child in such school.

A special department in the police force could be created to seek out such children for removal, and it should be sufficient to secure their committal to a reformatory institution, that a stipendiary magistrate or a Judge should be satisfied that their committal was desirable. About the children of an old offender there need of course be no hesitation. But there is no doubt

that some discretion would be required in the case of children under the control of persons who might be well known to the police as habitual criminals. It might be required of such persons that they should satisfy the proper authorities that the children were receiving due care. * It is possible that here and there a case would arise of this kind. Some man who had been an habitual offender, but had turned from his criminal career, quite unknown to the police, might be liable to be unjustly treated; but such cases would be comparatively rare, and while I would have all care taken to avoid injustice in such cases, I would act rigorously on the general principle that habitual criminals are unfit to have charge of children.

I would begin, then, with the children of such criminals,*and I would place them in the kindergarten of a reformatory institution, but for the reasons given at the commencement of this lecture, the children of criminal parents should be kept in a special department of such a school apart from those who are not of such origin. The theory of Froebel's system is, that the exercise of the physical and mental faculties, when that exercise is not accompanied by the appearance of compulsion, is both healthy and enjoyable. The limbs of the body are developed by marching and gymnastic exercise, and such games as children delight in; and all the tastes that depend upon the senses may be cultivated by drawing, singing, and modelling.

Wherever the kindergarten has had a fair trial, its beneficial effects have been abundantly manifest. The little pupils, under this delightful system of training, show a lively enjoyment of the teaching that is imparted, and a readiness to receive with real pleasure the knowledge which, under other systems of tuition, would be distasteful to the child mind.

Mrs. Cooper, a benevolent San Francisco lady, read a paper a short time ago before the Prison Convention of the Pacific Coast on "The Kindergarten as a Preventive of Crime," and in the course of this able contribution to reformatory literature,

mentioned this appalling fact: "It appears that from a single neglected child in a wealthy county in New York State, there has come a notorious stock of criminals, vagabonds, and paupers, imperilling every dollar's worth of property and every individual in the community. Not less than 1200 persons have been traced as the lineage of six children who were born of this one perverted and depraved woman."

But appalling as this one fact truly is, it is by no means novel. It is, in short, an inevitable and natural result of things as they are, and accordingly I agree with Mrs. Cooper when she says, "We must get hold of the little waifs, who grow up to form the criminal element just as early in life as possible. Hunt up the children of pauperism, of crime, of brutality, just as soon as they can be reached; the children that flock in the tenement houses, or the narrow dirty streets; the children who have no one to call them by dear names; children that are buffeted hither and thither, 'flotsam and jetsam on the wild, mad sea of life.' This is the element out of which criminals are made." The unanimous testimony of those who have given any attention to this subject is, that the kindergartens, wherever they have been established, have given abundant proof of their humanising influence. I would have the State hesitate no longer, then, but establish kindergartens as departments of reformatory institutions in all the large centres of population, and snatch the little children from those corrupting influences which breed misery for their future lives, and beget trained enemies to war against society.

Other departments of these reformatory institutions should take up the education of the children at say seven years of age. I would have first an elementary school, next a combination of elementary education and rudimentary technical instruction, and finally a finishing department in which technical instruction should predominate, and in which the "school" should be workshops. Imagine a boy three years of age taken from

criminal surroundings and placed in such an institution as I have thus roughly outlined. The first four years of his life he would spend in what has not been inaptly called "the paradise of children"—the kindergarten. The next four years he would spend in the elementary school. The succeeding two years he would be receiving further elementary education combined with rudimentary technical instruction. The last two years he would be occupied in acquiring knowledge of handicrafts. He would then be fifteen years of age, and at that age I would have him make his entry upon the life of a free citizen.

I am well aware that this would be a period of supreme difficulty, but I am convinced that any obstacle that might present itself would be easily surmounted, in the vast majority of instances, if the work of the preceding twelve years should have been attended with even a moderate amount of success. I am informed by those who have been for many years intimately associated with the management of industrial schools, that though difficulties occasionally present themselves in finding situations for boys and girls after they have finished their terms at the school, they are no greater than those of the ordinary applicants for labour. Employers of labour are generally found to be willing to take into their employment boys and girls who have gained such knowledge and experience as are imparted to children in industrial schools, and I see no reason to doubt that children brought up in the reformatory institutions of the kind I have indicated would find ample opportunity afforded them of pursuing an honourable career. If their training had been attended with a fair measure of success I am satisfied that the chances of their making their way in the world and of developing into intelligent and useful citizens would be vastly superior to what they are now. Certainly if we would minimise crime we must reduce to a minimum those who are brought up in an atmosphere of criminality. Oliver Wendell Holmes, in his own pungent way, says, that at the first indication of lying

in a child he would have it gently chloroformed into a better state of existence. I would begin sooner. I would take it for granted that children of habitual criminals and children brought up in criminal surroundings have a tendency to become criminal, and I would not wait for any manifestations of that tendency. I would take the children away from their present associations and purge them of the tendency to crime through the agency of the reformatory institutions.

It is unnecessary that I should dwell upon the character of the kindergarten and elementary departments of these institutions. These departments should resemble kindergartens and elementary schools such as we are already thoroughly familiar with.

In regard to the former, however, it may not be out of place to mention here that hints in regard to their management as well as arguments in favour of their establishment might be obtained by an inspection of the "shelter schools" of France referred to in the first Reports of the Royal Commission on technical instruction. The Commissioners say: "The number of children in the shelter schools in 1866-7 was 432,000, of whom three-fourths were received without payment. In 1879-80, the shelter-schools contained 606,000 children, of whom five-sixths were received without payment. These institutions can scarcely be styled 'infant schools' in the sense in which we ordinarily use the term. Their aim, besides affording shelter to children too young to attend the primary school, is principally to train the senses according to what is known as the *kindergarten* system. Much importance is attached to the training in these schools by those who are advocating the further development of manual work in elementary schools."

It is necessary, perhaps, that I should dwell more particularly upon the character of the higher departments of those reformatory institutions. Suppose a boy to have passed through the kindergarten and elementary departments, he would be, say,

ten years of age. He should now enter upon an important stage of his education. Instruction in the ordinary subjects should be accompanied by a moderate amount of instruction in the rudiments of a trade. After spending three years in this department, I would have him enter the finishing or technical department, in which the technical instruction should be specialised; and with reference to girls, the same course should be followed. There should be a careful attention to the development of the faculties in the primary departments, and an equally careful direction of manifest individual capacity into its proper channel in the secondary departments. The end to be kept carefully in view, throughout the whole course in these institutions, should be to turn out, at the age of, say, fifteen or sixteen years, boys and girls fitted in every way to become useful and honourable men and women. The work to be carried on in the secondary department would much resemble that already done in industrial and reformatory schools. But I am of the opinion that it might be carried to a much higher degree of perfection in institutions of the character here proposed.

One consideration of some importance here arises: The question will be asked what would you do with boys and girls such as are now frequently remitted to industrial and reformatory schools? My answer is, that I would have them remitted to these reformatory institutions, subject to the necessity for proper classification already insisted upon. I would throw upon the Boards of Management of these establishments all the responsibility I possibly could in the directions I have indicated, while taking care that the institutions, as departments of the public service, were lacking in nothing that was essential to their efficiency. In a word, I would organise the benevolent forces in the country in connection with State supported institutions for removing from evil influences all unfortunate and neglected children (such as has been specified at page 182), and especially those of habitual criminals. Or to put this

matter in another way, I would have the State say to the noble-minded men and women, everywhere to be found, who devote a great portion of their lives to a haphazard and often blind and little rewarded struggle to rescue the perishing: "Come, here are schools, amply furnished. Take under your charge these unfortunates whom you are seeking to save, from their earliest years until they arrive at an age to keep and guard themselves. Watch over them with a sympathetic care as they grow from childhood to youth, and then befriend them when they shall have to commence to fight the battle of life among the throngs of men."

LECTURE XXIII.

THE EDUCATION OF THE WORKING CLASSES.

Some Consequences of Defective Education—Contrary Result of various Public Educational Media—Waste of Capacity—Shelter Schools—Reforms of Elementary Schools—The Royal Commission's Report on Technical Instruction in France—Specification of Instruction given—Length of School Hours—The Defective Education of Girls—Reforms required—Higher Elementary Schools required—Free Meals for School Children—Specialisation of Technical Instruction—Enlargement of the Scholarship Incentive—Creation of Popular Universities—Double Character of Work—Day and Evening Classes—Scholarships open to Day and Evening Pupils alike—Provisions for Orphan Scholars—The Item of Cost—Note.

IN my previous lecture I dealt solely with the education of the children connected with the pauper and criminal classes. In the present lecture I propose to make some observations upon education generally, and I shall venture to enter into greater detail regarding the combination of manual and technical instruction with the ordinary branches of education. Experience has convinced me that many youths fall into bad habits and contract evil associations mainly in consequence of their education having been of a deplorably limited character. The efforts of social reformers should be directed to the mitigation of this calamity, and I am satisfied that the system of popular education in these three countries is easily capable of improvement in such a direction that the number of young people of both sexes who can be seen wandering aimlessly about the streets of all large towns in the evenings, and contracting habits that to say the least do not contribute to their own well-being

or the welfare of the State, might be enormously lessened. On the other hand, upon various occasions it has been my privilege and delight to witness the thronged public libraries, reading-rooms, art galleries, and museums, of cities and large towns in England, Scotland, and America, and, to a less extent, in Ireland, as well as to read the reports of public libraries and educational institutions, all showing that increasing numbers of young people are availing themselves of existing educational facilities. But, then again, how far has one to go from the Birmingham Free Library and Midland Institute, or the Manchester Mechanics' Institution, now a technical school; or how far has one to go from the various splendid educational establishments in the vicinity of St. George's Hall, Liverpool, or from Cooper Union, New York, or the Mechanics' Institute in Dublin, to discover that, after all, the crowds to be seen in most of these places so engaged as to make one's heart rejoice, are but as a drop in a bucket compared with the crowds to be seen elsewhere, in each and all of these towns and cities, so engaged as to make one's heart ache? Now the question is, how can we multiply the number of those who hunger and thirst after mental improvement, and the higher life which follows as "knowledge grows from more to more?" The waste of capacity is the most appalling of all wastes. I have known people argue profoundly about "waste in nature," and I have a hazy idea that the conclusion of the whole matter was that this waste was providentially ordained.

The argument, however, always appeared to me to be lacking in conclusiveness when applied to the appalling waste of human—may I not, indeed, say Divine—capacity going on around us every day. The question is not whether we can account for this waste, but whether we can do anything to prevent it. It appears to me that we can, with comparative ease, multiply the seekers after knowledge, and minimise this waste of capacity of which I speak; and I shall venture to indicate two directions

in which efforts should immediately be made with a view to the achievement of these desirable ends.

Our efforts should be directed in the first place to the improvement of our system both of elementary and higher education. And in the second place, to the better organisation of the educational forces already in existence in the large centres of population particularly with reference to higher education, and the creation of such forces where they do not already exist.

To begin with, then, I would establish in all towns and villages shelter schools to which children from four to seven years of age might be sent for the whole day; and, as far as possible, I would have similar schools established in country districts. These shelter schools should be really kindergartens, for I am convinced that the principles of Froebel are those which ought to underlie all enlightened educational efforts. I have already briefly indicated those principles, and it is unnecessary that I should enlarge upon them, for they are familiar to all interested in education. The shelter schools or kindergartens might be attached to existing infant schools, but I would have them much more plentifully scattered through the population. I have seen single streets in some of the large towns in which kindergartens in my judgment ought to exist. Of course parents are naturally unwilling to allow any young children to pass unprotected through busy thoroughfares, but this difficulty would be largely overcome if the necessity of crossing such thoroughfares were reduced to a minimum. And for the rest, if kindergartens were established in sufficient numbers, the elder children could take the younger ones to the kindergartens before proceeding to their own more advanced schools, and call for them again on returning.

Then I would have elementary schools more plentiful than they now are. I think our aim should be to have numerous schools of this character rather than a few large ones. The

character of these elementary schools I would change somewhat. They should be a combination of the kindergarten and the ordinary elementary school. But the work of the kindergarten should be of a more advanced nature. It should consist of manual instruction in the rudiments of a trade or an art similar to what is now given in many of the elementary schools of France. This manual instruction, however, should not push the literary instruction to the wall, for it appears that it is in this respect that such schools have been considered defective even in France. The Royal Commissioners on technical instruction in their first report drew attention to this matter, and it is very gratifying to find that what has been the desire of many earnest educational reformers in these countries has actually been tried in France. We learn from this report that manual work has in recent years been introduced into many primary schools in the city of Paris. In some the children are taught the rudiments of a trade; in others they are simply accustomed to the use of tools commonly employed in working wood and iron. The primary communal school of the Rue Tournefort seems to have attracted the special attention of the commissioners. This school was established as far back as 1873 it appears. The commissioners say, "Until the beginning of last year trade instruction was commenced at the age of ten years and continued for three years. During the first two years every child was taught drawing, modelling, carving, joiner's work and smith's and fitter's work. In the third year the work was specialised: some of the children being taught modelling and carving, others joiner's work and cabinet-making, others again forging and fitting. Since the beginning of last year the same plan has been continued, but in addition, the children in the lowest classes, beginning even at six years of age, have three courses of one hour each per week of the instruction in handicrafts, which, until then, did not begin until they had attained the age of ten years."

To complete the picture of this remarkable school the commissioners add: "Although, as has been said, the work is specialised in the last year, the pupils engaged in modelling and carving return one day in each week of that year to the joiner's bench and the forge; the joiners and turners return to the forge and modelling, and the smiths to modelling and joiner's work. The school hours are from eight in the morning till six at night, with a half holiday on Thursdays. In the highest class they have eighteen hours per week in the 'shops,' besides instruction in drawing, geometry, and natural science. There are 360 children in the school. The children on leaving this school are generally able to earn from two shillings and sixpence to four shillings per week."

Now I quote the observations of the Royal Commissioners on this school because I am thus enabled to say how far the primary communal school of the Rue Tournefort corresponds with my idea of what ought to be established in these three countries. "I should say, however, that the school hours are too long for general application to primary schools in England, Ireland, and Scotland; while from the age of seven to the age of ten simple manual instruction, taking an interesting and even an amusing form, would in my judgment be preferable, but the plan of the school of the Rue Tournefort might be copied with advantage in the higher elementary schools which should be established in all great industrial centres. The children in the school here mentioned are under the charge of the masters from eight in the morning until six in the evening—ten hours; and of that time about two hours appear to be occupied with technical instruction. I apprehend the people of these three countries would be unanimous in refusing to allow children of ten years of age to be under pedagogic rule for quite so many hours. From nine o'clock until five, or eight hours in all, would be as long a time as parents could be expected to tolerate the confinement of their children. Long hours at anything are

intolerable. Working men in France and other countries work too many hours, and they send their children to school for too many hours also. In Great Britain and Ireland a school-day of eight hours might be permitted, but two hours would have to be devoted to meals and recreation. Boys and girls from ten to thirteen years of age might fairly be expected to work six hours per day at school lessons, provided the lessons were sufficiently varied. At the Rue Tournefort there appear to be about two hours per day devoted to technical instruction. I consider that period of time sufficient, at all events, for the first two years, though it might be extended for children in their thirteenth year. The four hours remaining ought to be ample for purely literary instruction and music and drawing.

Of course the advanced manual or technical instruction which for children of from ten to thirteen years of age should succeed to the simple manual instruction given from the age of seven to the age of ten, should be adapted to the sex of the children. Girls should be taught the rudiments of such trades as women can conveniently engage in, though instruction in these should be subordinate to a much more careful training in the domestic arts than is common in England, Ireland, or Scotland at present. There is hardly any more glaring defect in the education system of these countries than the miserable provision made for the education of girls. It is gratifying to observe that the early education of boys is being gradually adapted to what are regarded as likely to be his necessities in after-life; but when we compare this with what is being done for girls with the same view, we must surely blush for shame. In the near future, we may depend upon it, women will be a far more important factor in both the industrial and political mechanism of society than they are now, and it would be well that this should be the case.

For, however generally superior to women men may flatter themselves they are, there cannot be a doubt that there are

many things beyond the domestic sphere which women are as well fitted for as men. Anyhow, we have no moral right to refuse to women the opportunity of achieving their independence of men in the struggle for existence. It is incumbent upon us to afford to girls as well as to boys in our elementary schools the opportunity of acquiring a rudimentary knowledge of such trades or occupations as they might subsequently find employment in if thrown upon their own resources for a livelihood. The number of such trades or occupations is constantly increasing, and it is impossible to do more than lay down a general rule applicable to both boys and girls, viz. that in all elementary schools containing pupils from ten to fifteen years of age, this technical education imparted should have a general reference to the future of the pupils of both sexes, and a particular reference to the trades or occupations of the part of the country in which any school is situated.

I speak of "fifteen years," for that is the age which, in my judgment, should be reached by children before leaving school. I am satisfied that many of the evils of our social system arise from sending children too early to work. I know well the dire necessity that compels, but I hope to be able to point a remedy for that ere I have done.

In the mean time, let me complete my idea of industrial education so far as it relates to primary schools.

I am now to deal with children of both sexes who have completed their thirteenth year. During that year they have been spending eight hours per day in school: four in literary instruction, two in technical instruction, and two in recreation, including meals. I would now extend the school hours and double the time allotted to technical instruction.

But the work now to be done should be carried on in schools known as higher elementary schools. These institutions should be perfect in every respect. They would receive pupils of both sexes at the age of thirteen years, and retain them until the

completion of their fifteenth year. The male and female teachers should be highly trained and well paid, and should be carefully chosen. I would have no teachers in these schools who were not fully qualified to act as competent educators, and none under the age of twenty-one. Workshops, class-rooms, dining-rooms, common rooms, recreation grounds—all should be provided, and dormitories where necessary. I am of opinion that every boy and girl in the three kingdoms should pass two years in a higher elementary school. And for the benefit of children whose parents live in country districts, I would have such a school established in every country town, and in case any children lived at a considerable distance from the school, I would have provision made for them to sleep on the premises. And here it may be as well to state that up to the age of fifteen I would have all education compulsory and free; and moreover, I would provide a free meal in the middle of the day for all the children. This latter provision I hold to be an indispensable one in any scheme of enlightened educational reform.

The instruction in these higher elementary schools for both boys and girls should be an extension of that given in the lower schools. Every effort should be made to perfect the work so far attempted; but greater attention should now be paid to the specialisation of technical instruction. Where the children expect to become farmers, particular attention should be paid to agriculture, and there should be attached to schools in country towns sufficient land to enable the children to make a practical acquaintance with this industry. Where, on the other hand, the children expect to become artisans, particular attention should be paid to those trades that are predominant in the various localities in which the schools are situated. In a town like Birmingham, for instance, there would be many higher elementary schools, and parents would have a choice, so that one school need not attempt to teach the rudiments of all the various

trades carried on in the hardware metropolis. The same remark would apply to Sheffield, and more or less to all large towns. But to Manchester, Dublin, Liverpool, Bradford, Belfast, Glasgow, and similar places, it might be expected that specialisation of technical instruction would not be difficult. It might be attended with unusual difficulties in places like Birmingham, but no one would venture to suggest that such difficulties would be insurmountable by Birmingham people.

But that there are no really insuperable difficulties in the way of such schools as are here proposed is attested by the fact that in France and other countries they already exist. And accordingly, whether there are difficulties in the way or not, it is absolutely certain that advances will have to be made in this direction before very long. A rudimentary knowledge of drawing, modelling, engraving, carving, and type-setting, might readily be imparted to both girls and boys alike of from thirteen to fifteen years of age; while elementary instruction in many other occupations having particular reference to the sex of the children might also be given, as for example, millinery, lace-making, embroidery, and domestic economy for girls; and fitting, forging, stone-cutting, and joinery for boys, in addition to general literary instruction. And no one can doubt that, once the urgency of educational reform in this direction was duly recognised, all obstacles would rapidly disappear.

It is perhaps right to add, the programme of elementary education here sketched does not contemplate home lessons—excepting, of course, the moral and religious teaching which it is presumed most parents impart to their children. So far as my observation has extended, it has led me to the conclusion that as far as possible the children should have done with books when they leave the school-room. After that let them amuse themselves to the top of their bent. And whenever possible, playgrounds should be large enough to be used as recreation grounds after school hours. If I could have my way, every

elementary school should have at the very least two acres of playground attached.

We have now arrived at perhaps the most critical period in the education of children, but I maintain that if we have been happy in our choice of competent teachers, the instruction which has so far been imparted will have been received gladly, and will have effectually inclined the minds of the children to the pursuit of knowledge. And now that we are about to dispense with the element of compulsion, it is desirable that facilities should abound of which the boys and girls might take further advantage, and that every inducement should be held out to them to do so. Pupils of higher elementary schools therefore should be encouraged by the prospect of obtaining scholarships of moderate amount, but sufficient to enable them to pursue their studies in connection with the yet higher educational institutions that fall now to be considered.

Before passing on, however, perhaps it may be well to mention that the reformatory institutions to which I have already alluded should be exactly the same in this respect as the elementary schools, and that to the children in them scholarships should be awarded also, so that all children at the age of fifteen years should have a fair and an equal start in life.

Our real difficulties now begin. The question of questions for education reformers is how to organise higher education. Any one passing through the large towns of Great Britain must be struck with astonishment at the vast amount of energy displayed in connection with local educational institutions of a superior kind. Take the town of Birmingham. There is here a splendid Grammar School, an unsurpassed Midland Institute and School of Art, and the Mason College, not to speak of minor institutions. In all the great industrial centres, such as Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, Bradford, and Glasgow, there are similar institutions. In the smaller towns, also, there are kindred establishments. What is required to multiply many times the

efficiency of these institutions is simply organisation! It appears to me that the aim should be to consolidate these often competing institutions, and organically connect them with elementary schools, by taking up the work of education where it is left by the latter establishments. At the age of fifteen it is imperative that the children of the working classes should begin to earn their own living, but it is quite certain that there are hundreds and thousands of parents who would encourage their children to continue their education if they could. How can facilities be afforded them for doing so? Let us suppose that in Birmingham the elementary schools are modelled on the plan here suggested. Let us suppose further that the Grammar School, the Midland Institute, the School of Art, and the Mason College are parts of one organic school whose curriculum is but an extension of that of the higher elementary schools. Let the institutions named be known as the Birmingham University. Each institution with very little change could continue its work very much on present lines, but the aim should be to have within the University separate schools of literature, science, and art. In the science school, say the Mason College, there should be workshops for imparting technical instruction with particular reference to the industries in the locality. In fact, the apprenticeship schools of Paris might have their counterpart in the Birmingham Mason College. Now let the work done in connection with the University be of a double character. The day classes should be adapted to the instruction of students who are continuing their education untrammelled by work for daily bread. But there should be evening classes adapted to the instruction of students who have to earn their living in the day time. The magnificent results which have been already achieved in Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool, Glasgow, and indeed in all the larger towns of Great Britain by evening classes (unfortunately evening classes of this kind are scarcely known in Ireland), warrants us in hoping for results of which, as yet, no

one dares to dream, if only we can do something to increase the number of those able to take advantage of them. I firmly believe that the improved system of elementary education which is here outlined would result in multiplying many times the number of those who would be anxious to attend these evening classes, and reducing to a minimum the devotees of that unpleasant personage who pays special attention to people with idle hands. How can we respond to this noble anxiety? An essential step in this direction would be to put a stop to work at five o'clock in all factories, workshops, and other employments, making exceptions where absolutely necessary, as in the post office, the newspaper office, and so on. But, generally speaking, an end should be put to the employment of young boys and girls in "offices," warehouses, shops, and so forth, after the hour of five in the evening. Artisans have happily taken care of themselves to some extent in this particular, but there are plenty of artisans who work less hours than their own sons and daughters.

In the next place, the fees for these evening classes should be very small. They might be much higher in the day classes. The prizes in the evening classes should be equal in value to those in the day classes. The scholarships obtained in the higher elementary schools should be tenable for three years at the day classes, and should be worth not less than £20 per annum, in addition to free admission to the classes chosen. Many a man having a large family would be able to keep his brightest boy or girl at the University for three years in this way, as well as send the others to the evening classes. Can one measure the exertions which the most intelligent of the artisan classes would make to enable their children to take advantage of these facilities? And let me be quite clearly understood. These scholarships should not be limited in number. They should be the right of all children of higher elementary schools who attain a certain proficiency. The examining Board of the University

should every year make their pick from among the children who have completed their course at all the higher elementary schools in the town, and to all who satisfy the Board of Examiners, I would have the University say: "There is at your disposal a scholarship tenable for three years at our University. You can have free admission to the day classes and £20 per annum to provide yourself with food and clothing."

But my proposal is not yet complete. There would be many children without parents or immediate relatives. For the benefit of these I would establish a University Hall, where students might reside on easy terms, say upon surrendering one-half of their bursary. Admission to this Hall should not be an act of charity, but a right to those who should happen to be without other homes, and it should always be at the discretion of the University authorities.

There are doubtless many points which I have not considered, but there is one which I have deliberately omitted. I have not counted the cost; but I am perfectly satisfied that if all that has been here proposed were done at the national expense—say by spending a few millions less every year on "war paint," and devoting the money to "operations" against ignorance and vice-breeding in some such way as that pointed out in these lectures—a saving would be effected in other directions so great as to leave an enormous balance in favour of the general tax-payer.

WHEN making notes of the preceding lectures I had not had the advantage of reading the First Report of the Royal Commissioners on Technical Instruction. In transcribing my notes I was strongly tempted to make many quotations from this most valuable Report, and especially from the documents in the Appendix. It appears that in France the work of free public education is making great progress, and French education

reformers seem to have succeeded to a very large extent in impressing upon the public mind the necessity of combining manual and technical instruction with the ordinary literary instruction of elementary schools. This First Report of the Royal Commissioners is of much value, as showing what has been already accomplished, and what is contemplated by the great French nation, and it is important that education reformers should make themselves thoroughly familiar with the information it contains. But I have not seen reason to modify my views, as set forth in the preceding lecture, for it will be clear to all English, Irish, and Scotch readers that the work now going on in France, as well as that which is proposed to be done, however well adapted for France, is not equally so for Great Britain and Ireland. It is nevertheless admirably adapted to impress upon the public of these three countries the urgent necessity of seeking similar ends by a policy less open to the suspicion of being hostile to Christianity; and accordingly I strongly urge all who are interested in popular education to make a careful study of this First Report of the Royal Commissioners on Technical Instruction, which can be obtained through any bookseller from Her Majesty's Stationery Office, for the small sum of fourpence.

LECTURE XXIV.

RATIONAL RECREATION AS A PREVENTIVE OF CRIME.

The Free Libraries' Act—Necessity for its Compulsory Application—Loans of Books from Large to Small Libraries—Museums and Art Galleries—Peel Park Library and Museum, Salford—Unsatisfactory Classification in Museums—Exceptions in the Indian Department of South Kensington—Loans from Large to Small Museums—Travelling Lecturers—Art Galleries—Absurd Division of Subjects—Loans of Pictures and Statuary from Large to Small Galleries—Popular Lectures—Advantages of Extending same to Country Districts—Popular Music and Concerts.

THE end I have in view in making suggestions on education is, simply, a more generally-educated general public; because I believe that, other things being equal, a well-instructed people could do its daily work much better than now, and would enjoy a much higher degree of general comfort than at present. Such a people would, moreover, in the main, walk in virtue's ways, and would discover not only that these ways are intrinsically excellent, but economically best. The question, "Is life worth living?" would receive a practical answer in the affirmative. Life is not worth living now to the vast majority of people, for the reason that the life they live is rather that of mere beasts of burden than of men infinite in faculty.

Now, it is manifest that the suggestions contained in the preceding two lectures, even if immediately embodied in legislation, could not effect the end I have in view in less than a generation. But there are other methods by which the same end may be very greatly promoted, and of these I propose now to speak.

I would make the adoption of the Free Libraries' Acts compulsory. Town Councils, Town Commissioners, Local Boards, County Boards, should be charged with the duty of putting these Acts immediately into operation. There is scarcely any item of intelligence which should excite greater indignation than that which occasionally appears in newspapers, to the effect that such and such a town has declined to adopt the Free Libraries' Acts. It is probably not generally known that the Acts in question are capable of being adopted by "any borough, district or parish, or burgh of whatever population," but, I fear, it may be assumed that proposals to adopt the Acts in rural "districts" or "parishes" would meet with considerable opposition. Yet it cannot be doubted that in rural districts and parishes there is as great a necessity for free libraries as in boroughs. There is only one way of overcoming the opposition of ignorance, and that is by making compulsory what the "common sense of most" believes to be for the common good of all. Does any one seriously suppose that a people who have gone so far in the matter of public elementary education would refuse to go the length of insisting upon the establishment of the natural complement of public elementary schools—the public library? However that might be, I am convinced that all friends of popular education should apply themselves without delay to an amendment of the Libraries' Acts in the direction of making it compulsory upon local authorities to adopt them. In the mean time it is earnestly to be hoped that the working men of the towns will exert themselves to secure the adoption of these Acts at once.

For the purposes of the Free Libraries' Act, then, towns and villages and parishes should be grouped together; having regard, as far as possible, to the geographical distribution of higher elementary schools, and the superior schools or colleges, similar to those grouped together in my last lecture, to form the "Birmingham University." A maximum rate should be fixed,

but it should be supplemented from the National Exchequer to the extent of one penny for every halfpenny in the pound contributed by the local rates. This contribution from the National Exchequer would naturally involve a certain amount of supervision on the part say of the Minister of Education. It should be his duty, for example, to insist that certain books should be added to any particular library, if it should appear to him that there was a real desire on the part of any considerable section of the ratepayers of any particular locality to have such books added to the library. I make this suggestion with some hesitation, I confess, but it is made with a double view. In the first place, the National Exchequer in contributing aid to local libraries ought to be in some way represented in its disbursement. In the second place, it is only too well known that local authorities often contain some one or two men whose "conscientious convictions" will not suffer them to assent to the placing of certain books in the libraries under their control. Conscientious scruples of the kind referred to should always be respected, but they ought not to be permitted to stand in the way of the desire of any considerable number of ratepayers to have particular books placed within their reach. And there seems to me no better way of respecting these conscientious scruples than that of constituting a higher and generally more enlightened power—a sort of court of appeal. The Education Department, with a Minister of Education at its head, would seem to be a fitting authority to settle disputed questions of this kind, and if it should be said that this would mean that Parliament would now and then be involved in discussions on the merits of a particular book, I can only say that so far as I have been able to observe, it does appear to me that Parliament is frequently less usefully occupied.

But there is one suggestion that may be made here, with a view to the greater efficiency and more economical working of free libraries. When I have looked upon the magnificent collections

one provincial town to another, on loan. From the British Museum and other sources it ought to be equally possible to make similar selections to be loaned in like manner, and, accordingly, there is no reason why during one year there might not be, certainly in all the larger towns of Great Britain and Ireland, at least two collections such as those described. The loans should be accompanied on their tour by a curator whose services might be available as a lecturer; and on Saturday and Sunday afternoons, at an appointed hour, the curator might well be expected to conduct the visitors round the building, explaining as he proceeded the various objects of interest, and answering questions. Imagine such a loan from the Indian Museum deposited in any provincial town for six months; another from the Egyptian Department of the British Museum, carefully calculated to convey a distinct conception of the past history of India and of Egypt, the present social condition of the two peoples, and the industrial resources of their several countries, can any one doubt that the general public would acquire a much more correct view of the great Indian and Egyptian questions than they now entertain?

Hence I am convinced it would be highly beneficial if museums as a whole were more carefully organised. Every town might, of course, have its own permanent collections, but the maximum educational advantage of museums will never be realised until some such plan as that here suggested is generally adopted.

The same remark substantially applies to art galleries. For the most part these remind one of children's scrapbooks. The pictures are associated mainly with reference to the fitting of their frames. Space is so valuable that it is found necessary to huddle pictures most incongruously together. One general division is thought to be sufficient, viz. into water and oil and statuary. Now, without pretending to be an authority upon art, I venture respectfully to submit, that a room full of pictures and statuary is not necessarily an art gallery. What is required

is that there should be several rooms as spacious and well-lighted as possible, and moreover provided with seats; and the works of art should be classified with the object of producing a good effect upon the mind of visitors. Suppose one room devoted to pictures of the great masters. There should be so much space to spare that upon occasion there would be room for works of a similar character obtained on loan from other galleries. And so on through all the rooms. It is really incalculable to what an extent the utility of works of art might be multiplied by a proper system of loans arranged between the various museums and art galleries throughout the three countries.

Of course everything in this respect would depend upon management. In all places the Public Library, Museum, and Art Gallery should be under the control of a Board of Management, consisting of members of the town council or other local authority, principals of higher elementary schools, professors of colleges, and others interested in educational work. The expenses of such a Board should be paid partly out of the local rates and partly out of the National Exchequer. The chiefs of such institutions, as well as the heads of departments where the institutions were at all extensive, should be appointed directly by the Board of Management, whose constitution would be a sufficient guarantee that jobbery would be reduced to a minimum. Subordinate officials might well be appointed by their chiefs.

I am inclined to think that the result of an organisation of public educational institutions of this character on such a basis as is here sketched would result in the rapid growth of a class of officials of high culture and yet popular sympathies, whose efforts to make their several institutions promote their avowed object would lead to such an interchange of books, pictures, statuary, and objects of interest between different centres, as would keep up a perpetual popular interest. Thus would the work of education go on, while those who were being educated would be scarcely aware of it.

There are two other methods by which popular education might be very greatly promoted, and after briefly noticing these I shall have done with this branch of the subject. The popular lecture is one of the most efficient means of education. A great deal has been accomplished in this way by leading scientific men in Manchester, Glasgow, and other large centres of population, but only enough to show how much more might be done. The great difficulty is to make such things "pay." It is out of the question to expect that men competent to popularise science, or men of high literary and artistic culture, could undertake work of this description without adequate remuneration. And I therefore venture to suggest that principals of higher elementary schools and professors of colleges should be open to occasional employment as popular lecturers, not only in the large towns, but in the small towns and country districts. There are great numbers of enlightened men living remote from towns, who would be glad to organise a few public lectures during the long winter months if only they could obtain lecturers. It is not that the people are too poor in every case to pay for such things; it is that the taste of the public has not been educated up to that point of appreciation which is equal to a liberal expenditure upon its gratification. People who have to work hard all day "don't see the good" of lectures on scientific, literary, or artistic subjects. If it should be a lecture on "improved methods of agriculture," say, which some earnest clergyman was anxious to have delivered, the difficulty of finding the necessary funds in the locality most urgently requiring improved methods of agriculture would be insuperable. I only select a lecture on this subject as an illustration of what I mean. But it will easily be seen that if the money difficulty is insuperable in such a case, it would be ten times more so in the case of a lecture on the "Life and Writings of Dean Swift," in a similar locality. The fact is, what is wanted is a systematic scattering of good seed up and down the country. In some unlikely spot perchance the

seed would fall upon good ground, and good fruit spring forth. But as a general result a very greatly improved public taste might be looked for. Lectures on domestic economy for young women, on thrift for both young men and young women, on historical and other subjects, repeated by the same lecturer in a dozen or twenty different places, could not fail to have a very salutary and almost immediate effect.

It will be observed that I lay stress upon the application of the public lecture to country districts. I do so because after all the population of the country is always pouring into the town, and my idea is to do something to have it a less ignorant stream. Young men and young women coming up from the Arcadian simplicity of country life to its exact opposite in the busy manufacturing towns are naturally led away by the glitter and excitement of their new surroundings; but if their tastes had been to any serious extent formed by any such proposal as that just made, I am convinced that the glamour of town life would soon cease to blind their eyes to the more solid advantages to be derived from a diligent pursuit of knowledge through the more abundant facilities presented to them in their new life, and thus instead of adding permanently to the giddy throngs that haunt the public thoroughfares when the day's work is done, large numbers of them would crowd into the evening classes, libraries, and museums, which would stand invitingly open.

One other means of popular education is to be found in intelligent recreation. It is highly gratifying to find how steadily public opinion is growing in the direction of cheap popular concerts. Why should there not be a school of music as well as a school of art in connection with every considerable town? Music is taught in elementary schools, and should be more diligently taught. Let the work be carried on to the highest degree, as in the case of drawing and modelling and other branches of art. Then just as the teachers and professors already alluded to form a staff of public lecturers, so the teachers

and professors of music could apply themselves to the work of improving the popular taste by good music. There is nothing in the way of great and successful efforts in this direction. All that is required is organisation and funds. In all the public parks there should be bands playing at least two evenings in every week as well as two afternoons. In all towns and villages, particularly in the winter, local musicians might be encouraged to get up concerts by being assured of the assistance of teachers from the nearest school of music, who should be paid for their services as the public lecturers would be paid for theirs. I confine myself to recreation of this kind, because physical recreation is more readily provided by the people themselves, according to their several tastes, and it is only required that in every town and village there shall be a public park or recreation-ground such as have been already spoken of in connection with public libraries.

However, an exception must be made in the matter of bathing. Free public baths, it appears to me, are an urgent necessity, and they should be connected with the public parks. But beyond the provision of facilities for bathing and gymnastic exercises, it is hardly necessary to go in this direction.

It is necessary, however, to go much further than we have already gone in the matter of popular concerts, both under cover and in the open air. It is hardly required that the principle of compulsion should be introduced. Everything necessary would be gained by grants either from the local rates or from the National Exchequer. I do not see, for example, why every town or village should not have its public band or musical society, receiving a grant in aid from the local rates or from the National Exchequer. It would be but an extension of the principle now in operation in the science and art department of South Kensington in reference to science classes. The grants might readily be made contingent upon the due performance of certain specified public services. What is really wanted is

simply this—something to stimulate local exertion. In every locality a small minority is always to be found more or less enthusiastically devoted to the promotion of education; some are in favour of science classes, some of art classes, some of music classes. I would have the State say to these earnest men and women: "Come now; for every pound which you can raise locally to further your aims we will give you so much more. There are in your midst highly-educated principals of schools, and professors in all departments of literature, science, and art. Go to these for help, and if you cannot find sufficient money to accomplish your purpose we will do our best to meet you."

In this way I am persuaded the movement in favour of popular education and rational recreation would be so effectually promoted that crime would speedily diminish, and a healthier moral tone pervade public life.

LECTURE XXV.

CAUSE OF POVERTY.

Contrasts of Wealth and Poverty—Why are the Poor so very poor?—The Drink Theory—Little or no Inducement for Thrift—Wages kept to a semi-starvation point by Competition and Monopoly—Diminution of Population not Increasing Wages—Relations of Land and Labour—How Land Monopoly has robbed Labour in Ireland—Industry ground down to the Bare Living Point of Remuneration—"Population Tending to Overtake the Means of Subsistence" fallacy exploded as regards Ireland—Monopoly's Dictum to Labour—The same Principle behind the whole Industrial System—Power and Privilege robbing Labour and manufacturing Poverty—Abolition of Land Monopoly absolutely essential to the diminution of Poverty.

IF ignorance is an evil, scarcely less so is poverty. And it is with poverty as it is with ignorance; it is bad in itself as well as in its effects. In the present and some succeeding lectures I propose to investigate the causes of poverty.

Perhaps it is necessary to say a few words in the first place, however, upon the existence of poverty. We are told that the poor are not nearly so poor as they used to be, and statistics are quoted to show that the incomes of the working classes have increased in a much higher ratio than have the incomes of other classes within the last fifty years. Admitting all this, the circumstance has still little or no bearing on the real questions at issue between labour and monopoly. For in the first place, what is the good of quoting figures which, after all, are more or less the results of estimates formed upon uncertain and insufficient data, when the great industrial centres present us with the most awful contrasts of wealth and poverty? In the richest counties in England, Ireland, and Scotland, the miserable hovel is the inevitable accompaniment of the magnificent mansion.

The question, therefore, is not whether or not the incomes of the working classes have greatly increased of late years, but whether or not there is a weight of poverty which is capable of being removed. And again, what is the good of quoting statistics when the question is not whether or not the incomes of the working classes have greatly improved within recent years, but whether or not the working classes have received heretofore, or are receiving now, their just share of the wealth which is the result of their labour. The real questions are—Is there an unnecessary amount of poverty in these three kingdoms and in the world? Does the worker get a fair share of the wealth which labour produces? In my humble judgment, the first of these questions must be answered in the affirmative; the second in the negative. It is accordingly now my aim to submit certain reasons which account for this state of things, and certain suggestions which, if adopted, would, I think, tend to remedy the more glaring evils of the existing social system.

Why are the poor so very poor? Some people say, because they are so thriftless, and “give way to drink.” My study of life does not bear out this charge. Possibly the poor are thriftless and intemperate, but so also are the rich, and it is even accounted a fortunate circumstance when a rich man spends his money freely. But what have the poor to be thrifty with, and what reason have they to be temperate? Would poverty be abolished if all working men and women became thrifty and temperate to-morrow? I do not think so. We are told that wages tend to the minimum upon which the wage-earners will continue to subsist—that is to a bare living. Those who get more than suffices for a bare living may be thrifty, and will find it to their advantage to be temperate. But to the great mass of workers who get only a bare living thrift and temperance are rendered almost impossible virtues. If they all managed to subsist on something less than a bare living, wages would “tend” to that reduced minimum, and so we should reach that absurdity

which was illustrated in the case of the man who proposed gradually to reduce the food of his horse to one straw per day, and did so only to find that the unlucky animal died the day after his first meal of one straw. If wages really do tend to this minimum of which we hear so much, is it not clear that greater thrift and temperance on the part of all workers whose wages are but a bare living would but result in still lower wages to them, and still greater profits to their capitalist employers?

Look at what has happened in my own country. Years ago the farmers of Ireland paid their rents partly out of the proceeds of what we may call auxiliary industries. Gradually these have largely disappeared from the country. What remains of them are concentrated now in the towns. But rents have gone up, and the struggle for existence has been so severe that population steadily declined. Millions have gone to other lands, yet those who have remained at home are not a whit better off. The "wages" of the Irish farmers have gone down; but the rent-rolls of Irish landlords have gone up; and it is now a settled fact that the thrifty and temperate farmer, who invested the results of his thrift and temperance in improvement upon his farm, has paid the penalty in an increase of rent. And again, wherever a railway has been laid down, wherever market towns have sprung up, wherever harbours have been constructed, there have rents been raised yet higher. In fact, in Ireland, where manufacturing industries are so limited in extent, the real relations between land and labour are more clearly seen. It is plain that they are absolutely essential to one another. It is plain that land is valueless without labour. It is equally plain that labour cannot exert itself without land. In a country teeming with manufacturing industries these simple but essential relations are largely obscured. In a purely agricultural country, however, such as Ireland, the truth is clearly seen.

Let us in imagination transport ourselves to one of the many beautiful and fertile valleys which entrance the tourist upon his

first visit to Ireland. Let us suppose it is summer. Scattered through the valley are the thatched homesteads, surrounded by their fields of waving grass and corn and flax; the potatoes are strong and healthy, and there is every promise of a plentiful harvest. In a very short time there will be food enough in that valley to feed ten or twenty times the population inhabiting it. Yet are those who till that land and make it fruitful in the direst poverty; so poor that they dare not eat their own butter and eggs, nor drink the milk of their own cows. The people of this valley, rich with food, must content themselves with a diet of potatoes, butter-milk, and occasionally oaten meal. And if that potato crop should fail, the people would positively starve. Why are these poor people so very poor? The reply is simple. There does exist, though these poor folks never see him, a man called a landlord, who has the power to appropriate all the results of the industry of these poor people to his own use and benefit, and does appropriate all save what suffices to afford to them in ordinary circumstances a bare living. If any of the crops fail, the landlord does not moderate his demand; the "bare living" of these poor people is reduced to starvation point. And that once upon a time it reached that point is evident, as the ruins of many a cottage serve to testify. Why are these poor people so very poor? Can it really be because population tends to overtake the means of subsistence, and thus forces wages down to "a bare living" point? Certainly not in this case, for here nature and the hand of man have combined to redouble the fertility of the valley, while the greed of one man is responsible for the reduction of its population. Clearly it is no increase of population here that has forced wages down to the minimum of a bare living. One thing, and one alone, is the cause of the poverty of these poor people, and it is this—that an unseen but all-powerful hand comes in just when the labourer is reaping the reward of his labour and snatches it from his grasp. Here are land and labour in happy co-operation,

but of the land one man is able to say: "This is mine; to me belongs the power of life and death. It is my prerogative to dictate to you workers the terms, if any, upon which I will permit you to work at all. My terms are the whole of the produce, less what will just suffice to enable you to maintain a bare subsistence. The moment I see—for though you cannot see me I can see you—the moment I see any of you by thrift and temperance making more than a bare living I shall increase your rent. The moment I find that any of you by thriftlessness and intemperance are unable to pay your rent, I will get rid of you—I will not permit you to get a bare living even." Labour has no resource but submission; for though labour is represented by a thousand pairs of hands, the owners of those hands must either work or starve. They cannot take the owner of the land by the scruff of the neck, and say, "You, sir, shall either work or starve," for the owner of the land has law on his side, and the British army at his back.

Now the advantage of this illustration is that in this typical valley the problem is reduced to its simplest terms. There were land and labour, and no complex industrial system to obscure their relations or to conceal the operation by which the land monopolist appropriated the produce of labour. It was quite easy to see that the population of the valley entirely depended upon the monopolist of the land. He would allow just so much subsistence as would secure him the largest amount of wealth. If, for example, he found that five hundred men working for a bare living could hand over to him as much wealth as a thousand men working on the same terms, he would take care to deny even a bare living to the unnecessary five hundred. Hence it is clearly not population pressing on subsistence which compels men to work for a bare living, but a privileged class, for its own advantage, limiting the subsistence available to workers. The wrong is due to "the injustice of society," and *not* "to the niggardliness of nature."

Of course it is easy to say that even though there were no land monopolist in the case, and the valley belonged wholly to its inhabitants, the population would rapidly multiply and very soon overtake the means of subsistence—so that it is still true that population tends to overtake subsistence. But I answer, a tendency on the part of population to overtake subsistence does not necessarily mean that the tendency will be carried on to the bare living point. If Labour were its own master it would elect to live a higher life than is possible to it so long as it is a slave; and accordingly, though population might increase to a bare living point, it is absolutely certain that the bare living with which Labour in a state of freedom would be satisfied, would be luxury compared with the bare living with which in a state of slavery it must perforce be content. Wherever workers are free to fix the terms upon which they are willing to work, we find that these terms include something more than the bare living for which those are content to work who are not free to fix their own terms.

But why discuss this supposed tendency any further? The catastrophe to which it points, in any case, is as remote as the exhaustion of the coal-fields, if not as distant as the earth's absorption into the sun. Look at the vast areas of uncultivated land in Ireland, and the still larger tracts of land in Scotland and England that are given over to cattle and game; and then think of the capabilities of America and the British Colonies. Add to all this the admitted fact that the productive powers of such land as is already under cultivation might easily be doubled, and in many cases trebled, by improved methods of agriculture; and how can we come to any other conclusion than this—that when the population of the world is within measurable distance of reaching the limit of subsistence afforded by the earth and the waters under the earth, it will be time to be alarmed; but that meanwhile we may go on, though indulging the hope that ere we reach the limit of our resources we shall

have hit upon a rate of multiplication which will be consistent with a mode of life at least superior to that which is possible or permissible under the existing social system.

And now if we extend our view, we shall find at the back of our complex industrial system exactly the same thing that we observed in the simple relation of labour and land to which I have just referred, viz. the hand of power and privilege appropriating most of the wealth produced by labour, and returning only a bare living to the labourers, and thus in effect saying, that subsistence shall only be afforded to the extent which secures the richest results to the class which neither toils nor spins. Who, then, under these circumstances can deny that there does exist an unnecessary weight of poverty, or affirm that the worker receives a fair share of the wealth that is produced by his labour?

The first step to be taken with a view to diminish poverty and secure to the worker a fair share of the results of his industry is, therefore, to put an end to land monopoly. I do not say that this is all that is necessary, but I do affirm that until this is done nothing is done. I admit that changes of a very drastic nature are required in what are known as the relations of labour and capital, and of these it will be necessary to say something a little further on. Here I have only to insist that so long as land is private property, the landed can and will appropriate the wealth produced by labour. For consider what has been the effect of improvements in the methods of industry and labour-saving inventions. Go back to the fertile valley to which we have already referred. Every improvement there was quickly followed by an increase of rent. The worker who improved his land, or his tools, or his methods of cultivation, benefited nothing. His condition was not improved at all, the improvement went straight into the pocket of the landlord—the land monopolist. And so it would still be if some fine day labour-saving machinery or improved methods should double the produce of that valley. The same thing would go on if our whole in-

dustrial system were suddenly changed from a system of competitive to one of co-operative production. The land monopolist could just as easily dictate terms to co-operators as to competitors.

And as a matter of fact he does. Co-operation, so far as it has yet been tried, has doubtless been of great advantage in many ways, but the lesson it teaches to my mind is the same as that which the repeal of the Corn Laws taught me. It was idle to abolish the monopoly in corn and leave untouched the monopoly in the land which grew the corn. Free Trade is no doubt a good thing, but the working classes have not yet realised at all adequately its enormous advantages. In like manner, if a system of co-operative production—and one may take that phrase to include everything in the shape of improvements, whether in the worker or in his methods of working—were to-morrow substituted for that which exists to-day, so long as the land monopoly remained we should be where we are so far as labour is concerned. Co-operative mills and co-operative stores are plentiful in the north of England; but they have to pay rent, like their neighbours. And rent not only for the land that the mill or the store stands on, but rent for the houses that the people live in, drink in, worship in; rent for the streets they walk on, and the railroads they ride on—and that rent is not what they will give; it is what the monopolist will take.

Land monopoly, landlordism, or private property in land is

“The leprous distilment, whose effect
Holds such an enmity with blood of man,
That swift as quicksilver it courses through
The natural gates and alleys of the body,
And with a sudden vigour it doth posset
And curd, like eager droppings into milk,
The thin and wholesome blood.”

And until we purge the body politic of this “leprous distilment,” all our schemes for the amelioration of the condition of the poor, all our efforts to secure to every man a fair day’s wages for a fair day’s work, are alike vain.

LECTURE XXVI.

REMEDIAL PROPOSALS.

The Abolition of Land Monopoly—Prof. Newman's Opinion—The Advantages of National Proprietary, or State Ownership of Land—National and Individual Benefit—How it would tend to increase Wages—Lord Derby and the Sands of Bootle—How National Proprietary would put an end to Speculative Land Values—The effect of throwing tied-up Land open to Labour—Increasing Food Produce, and enlarging the Field of Industry—Collateral Public Benefits—The Incidence of the Land Tax—Contrast between Cass and State Ownership—Conditions of Occupancy under State Ownership—The Position of the Farmer under Same—Practically the Owner of his Holding subject to just Conditions—How the Agricultural Labourers would benefit through State Ownership—Summary of Benefits to the Community from State Ownership.

I would abolish land monopoly by simply taxing all land, exclusive of improvements, up to its full value. By the term improvements I mean such erections or qualities as can be clearly shown to be the results of the labour of those now in the occupation or enjoyment of the land or their predecessors. In other words, I would recognise private property in the results of labour, and not in land. But what of the landlords, it will be asked? A similar question was once asked of the late George Stephenson, in reference to a much more useful animal. Mr. Stephenson was asked what would happen if a cow should get in the way of a locomotive, and the eminent engineer remarked that it would be "a bad job for the cow." Similarly I am free to confess that if my proposal were carried into effect it would be a bad job for the landlords. I can only say that I should be very willing to consider candidly, and with

every desire to be just, any suggestions that might be made with a view to mitigate the misfortune which such a change as I here recommend would be to them, but I do not feel called upon to make any suggestions of my own. Various suggestions have been made, but for the most part they appear to me to be more or less ingenious and effective devices for perpetuating the evils of the existing system. I greatly fear that the landlords will have to be sacrificed unless they get out of the way of their own accord. They have a very bad case, so bad indeed that Prof. Newman says of them that "if justice could be wisely and rightly separated from mercy, they might be treated as rudely and curtly as their ancestors under Henry VIII. treated the farmers and peasants, whom they massacred and hanged by the roadside." We must not strain "the quality of mercy," nor must we permit "offence's gilded hand to shove by justice." But inasmuch as I propose to consider one or two suggestions in regard to the best way of dealing with the landlords in my next lecture, it is unnecessary to dwell further upon the point now.

We may turn at once to the consideration of the advantages of a national proprietary of land as opposed to a class monopolisation. I claim that constituting the land the property of the State would tend to annihilate poverty by securing to every worker a fair day's wages for a fair day's work. If the entire annual revenue from the landed property of Great Britain, exclusive of tenants' rights, but inclusive of mines and minerals, were turned into the National Exchequer, it would be found to amount to an enormous sum. The Chancellor of the Exchequer would look at it with glistening eyes and watering lips. He would doubtless turn to that charming romance, "What I can do with a shilling," in the hope that by simple multiplication he might discover what he could do with two or three hundreds of millions of golden sovereigns. If the Minister of Education called upon him, the Chancellor would hail his colleague's

advent with delight. But even that functionary's demands, though he should have to administer such a system of education as that previously sketched, would leave the pile not appreciably diminished. And if those who are included in the Civil List should call upon the dazed Chancellor, they would retire, leaving the "income" practically untouched. The only demand which could possibly be made upon the national treasurer, and occasion him any anxiety in reference to a surplus, would be a demand for the immediate extinction of the national debt. Suppose the Chancellor should, however, elect to respond to a request preferred by the President of the Local Government Board for ten or twenty millions to be expended in the better housing of the poor, he would still have a large balance. At present there is raised in Great Britain by local and general taxation about £100,000,000 sterling per annum. All this the Chancellor of the Exchequer would remit, and defray the entire cost of local and general administration by the revenue from the land and minerals. I have seen it estimated that the ordinary artisan pays between 10 and 20 per cent. of his income in indirect taxation. To this extent at least the change which is here proposed would mean an increase of wages.

But perhaps the most effective and direct way in which national ownership of land would tend to increase wages, is that a stop would be put to speculative land values. Wages are paid out of the produce of labour; but it is clear that if an undue share of that produce is appropriated to the payment of rent, there must be less to appropriate to the payment of wages. Put an end to speculative land values, and you diminish the share of produce falling to rent, and increase the share falling to wages. A single illustration will suffice to make my meaning clear. A few years ago the sands of Bootle, near Liverpool, were the "waste." But presently the space was required for a new dock. The Earl of Derby stepped in and demanded a large sum for the Bootle Sands; no less a sum than £100,000. Under candidly, and with

The result is, that the Liverpool people pay no less than £8000 per annum for land that had positively no real value before the docks were constructed. Manifestly this speculative value is a tax upon industry, a limitation of the amount of produce which would otherwise be available for wages. I do not say that the whole of this sum would fall into the pockets of working men; but I do say that other things being equal it would do so. There are others than landowners who reap where they have not sown. But at present I am only concerned to show that the tendency of speculative land values is to limit the share of produce falling to wages, and to point out that the checking of speculative land values would have a contrary tendency.

In point of fact, the State being in reality the people, it would administer its inheritance, the land, with a single eye to the welfare of the entire people. The black mail which the Earl of Derby levied upon the industry of Liverpool is only a sample of what goes on every day. No landlord will permit a railway to cross his estate unless he is "compensated," and the amount of "compensation" always exceeds the value of the land as it stands; the sum demanded approximates as nearly as possible to what it is estimated the land will be worth when the railway has been made. In addition to this, the rents of all lands contiguous to the line are at once raised. So again in the case of mineral deposits. No landlord will permit mines to be opened on his estate without first stipulating for royalties. And thus in a hundred ways black mail is levied upon the industry of the people. And this is the natural result of private property in land. The landowners regard their own private interests as paramount. If the State were the owner of the land the public interests* would be the paramount consideration. It is plain that the temptation to hold for higher prices would not affect the State as it affects the private landowner, and that accordingly one of the most immediate effects of a national proprietary would be to remove those restrictions upon industry which, as

matters now stand, result in that most melancholy spectacle--troops of idle men looking on land they may not touch, and thousands of families living on starvation diet and in miserable city dens while millions of acres of fruitful land are occupied as game preserves, and shut out from purposes of human sustenance or shelter. We read again and again of so many thousands of men being out of employment in this or that great manufacturing town. And in fact we may at any time see with our own eyes how bitter, on the very lowest rung of the social ladder, is the struggle for a bare living. For let us propose to leave a railway-station carrying nothing more than a small hand-bag, half-a-dozen miserable creatures will almost throttle each other for the privilege of carrying it for a few pence. And this struggle is repeated with diminishing intensity in every stratum of society. Amongst the artisan and labouring classes, however, it is most intense. Now, what is the immediate cause of this cut-throat competition? Can it be any other than this, that "the landed" instead of facilitating the access of labour to the land, positively forbid it, except on monopolist terms? It must be remembered that the rate of wages is determined under existing conditions by the minimum upon which those on the lowest rung of the social ladder can subsist. Put these, then, in a position to demand higher wages, and you do the same thing for everybody who lives by labour. Now, who can doubt for a moment that once the power and the privilege of preventing this access of labour to land, except upon terms which enable the hand of power and privilege to appropriate the lion's share of the produce, were checked, a social and economic revolution would be almost instantly effected? It is the rush of the unemployed agricultural population to the towns which intensifies the struggle for existence, and thus enables employers to fix the rate of wages on the basis of the least they will give, viz. bare subsistence. If we can check that rush we shall reverse the position, and enable the workers to fix the rate of wages on

the basis of the least they will take. Nor ought it to be very difficult to accomplish this. We have only to make the nation the proprietor of the land. Tax land in city, town, and country up to its full value, and no one would find it to his advantage to hold for higher prices, for he would simply be holding for a higher public tax. The millions of acres of land now lying waste in Great Britain would instantly come into cultivation. The State, from its abundant revenue, could advance large sums for the reclamation of the land, and the result would be that instead of there being, as now, an unemployed agricultural population, there would be a demand for labour so great that many generations must elapse before population could overtake subsistence. The mineral resources would be equally thrown open. It would be the interest of the State to impose conditions that would have the effect of encouraging instead of discouraging the development of these resources, and again in this field the demand for labour would far exceed the supply. And thus, instead of the competition being, as now, between workers seeking employers, it would be between employers seeking workers, and wages would rise all along the line.

Consider, for a moment, what this would mean. It would mean, in the first place, an enormous increase in the production of wealth as well as its more equitable distribution. It would mean, in the second place, all but the abolition of poverty. Workhouses would have to be revolutionised, if not entirely done away with. The crime, which is mainly the offspring of poverty, would tend to a minimum.

Think, too, what the effect of placing all taxation upon land values would mean in another direction. It is said that of every pound collected for the relief of the poor in these three kingdoms, over fifty per cent. is absorbed in expenses of collection and administration. The same remark applies to a greater or less extent to all other of the existing taxes. The cost of their collection is enormous. It may, indeed, be confidently affirmed

that there is hardly a single tax which is at once easy to collect, fair in its incidence, and abundant in its yield. Taxation of land values would comply with all these conditions. Nothing is easier than to fix the value of land irrespective of improvements. It is done every day in the United States as well as in Great Britain. And no tax could be more easily or more cheaply collected. Those in the occupation or employment of the land might readily pay their respective assessments as they fell due, or as they pay their other liabilities, to an authority appointed for the purpose. Or the land tax might be paid into the nearest post office to the credit of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and a stamped receipt obtained, which would be the tenant's title to the occupancy of his holding.

And then what tax could possibly be fairer in its incidence? Take a plot of land far away from any town; its value would be comparatively small. Take again a plot of land in the heart of a great city; its value would be comparatively large. Between these two extremes it is plain that the value of any plot of land would be accurately measured, and it is equally plain that every square yard of the land of any country would by this means be taxed in accurate proportion. Agricultural land would, acre for acre of course, be more lightly taxed than municipal land. But so nicely can land values be adjusted that it is absolutely certain that except in very rare cases no one paying a land tax would be called to pay one penny more than the land in their occupation was worth. A factory owner might pay as much for a quarter of an acre as a farmer would pay for a hundred acres, and still the incidence of the tax be absolutely just, for as much wealth might be produced upon the smaller as upon the larger area.

Then upon the abundant revenue which such a tax would yield, it is not necessary to dwell further than I have already said. But I may point out that, inasmuch as only that value as imparted by the community would be appropriated

for common purposes, leaving improvements the property of the person who might make them, we have reserved the most powerful incentive to improvements of every kind. The land tax assessed as thus indicated could never be a burden, for the simple reason that a plot of land would always be worth its value, and accordingly agricultural and manufacturing industries might be pursued with perfect confidence on the part of those engaged in them that all the wealth which they could create by their own efforts would be their own; while the community would have the satisfaction of knowing that the value which attached to the land by reason of the integration of population, would fall into its legitimate place—the National Exchequer.

How simple, natural, and just is such an arrangement as compared with that which now obtains! Under existing circumstances a privileged few appropriate not only the value of which an industrious population is the sole creator, but also practically all the wealth produced by that industrious population itself, less only what is sufficient to give a bare living to actual workers. Under the new order of things of a national proprietary, every individual worker would be in a position to command exactly that share of the wealth produced which he had by his labour created; while the community at large would be put in possession of that portion of the wealth produced of which it was the sole creator. The worker in every case would get his own, no more, no less. The community would do the same.

So far I have considered the effect of national proprietorship of the land upon the industrious portion of the community as a whole. The relation of labour to the land is always and everywhere the same, but it is at once more simple and direct in agricultural industry, and can in consequence be seen there most clearly.

Let it be remembered that it is the annual value of the bare land, irrespective of improvements, which it is proposed to

appropriate in the form of taxation. Accordingly, no question of who the improvements belong to can arise. Under the system of national proprietary, the tiller of the soil would practically be the owner of his farm, subject only to such conditions as the State might impose. It would be the interest of the State to frame such conditions as would serve to promote the greatest good of the people at large. The conditions might reasonably include—1st, That the land should be cultivated; 2nd, that it should not be subdivided beyond certain limits; 3rd, that the cultivator should not hold more land than he could personally superintend; 4th, that the State should have power to grant liberty to work the mines and minerals, subject to reasonable compensation to the tenant for disturbance or injury of any kind to the value of the occupancy.

I only mention these as samples of the conditions that might be imposed; but it is proper that I should say perhaps that the State would have a perfect right to impose conditions upon the tenure of land, whether used for agricultural or other purposes, for the simple reason that land is a fixed quantity. Of course the farmers generally would be chiefly interested in the amount to be levied as a tax. The tax is to be the annual value of the bare land. Manifestly that would vary according to circumstances. If a farm is situated within five miles, say, of a large town, the value of the occupancy of that land would be higher than if the farm were fifteen miles distant. So far then the effect of such a tax would be to put all farmers on an absolutely equal footing. A farmer residing near a town might be called upon to pay more for the occupancy of the same amount of land than a farmer living twenty miles away; but he would have his equivalent in the facility with which he could put his produce into the market. Under these circumstances it is quite possible that the real value of land of equal quality might vary from as much as one pound to one shilling per acre. But suppose that an agricultural holding is twenty miles from the

nearest market town, and that that is but a small place, and that the produce of the farm when it reaches the market town has to be further conveyed a hundred miles by rail. Naturally the annual value of a farm of land so situated would be comparatively small, owing to its backward situation. Now, in the first place, it could be no hardship to the farmer to be called upon to pay his tax, for he would have its exact equivalent in the bare land. In the second place, it would be no advantage to him to compound with the government for the amount, for if he purchased the land at its true value, he would but be sinking money in the land, which it would be better worth his while to employ in improvements. In the third place, subject to this payment and to the other conditions I have named, the farm would be a freehold. It would be the tenant's to sell to the highest bidder if he so pleased, so that he did not infringe the law as to subdivision. Every improvement he made would realise its full market value to himself and to no other. In the fourth place, the benefit to the farmer would be immediate. He would not have to wander forty years in the wilderness only to catch sight of the promised land at last. In the fifth place, the farmer would have to pay no taxes, for the revenue from municipal and agricultural land would suffice for all purposes. Thus national proprietary or State ownership of the land would instantly constitute every farmer the practical owner of his farm, subject only to the yearly payment to the State of the annual value of the land exclusive of his improvements, and relieve him at once of those taxes and rates which he now pays in addition to his rent. This would mean an immediate practical advantage to the farming class, which could not fail to produce a very healthy influence upon agricultural industry. Farming would begin to pay. The demand for labour would be so great that labourers would be able to secure their full earnings.

Indeed it is in its effect upon the condition of the agricultural labourer that the virtues of national proprietary are most obvious

The fact that all land would be taxed up to its full value, whether it was in use or not, would throw open for cultivation the millions of acres now lying waste or given up to the mere preservation of game. By a system of judicious advances the State would certainly encourage the settlement upon this land of all persons able and willing to cultivate it. In so far as the land now lying waste is in need of drainage on a large scale, this could be done at the public expense, and its increased value by reason of this drainage would be quickly returned to the revenue. It would be the interest of the State to encourage the cultivation of every available acre of land, because an abundant and a cheap supply of food is the first essential to a prosperous commonwealth. The agricultural labourers would be the most likely class in the community capable of engaging in this enterprise. To them would belong the privilege, therefore, of choosing whom they would serve—a large farmer for weekly wages, or themselves as tenants of the small holdings into which the State would at once divide the vast areas of land now lying waste while multitudes perish of hunger. The cut-throat competition which now exists to obtain the bare living, which is all that the land monopolists permit to the lowest scale of workers, and which shows itself more or less mischievously in every stratum of society, would be destroyed at its very source. The agricultural labourer, instead of being, as now, the object of profound compassion to all men who can feel for their fellowmen, would have his share of the land, or its equivalent in higher wages; he would have his foot firmly planted on the first rung of the social ladder, and it would be his own fault if he did not rise to a position of comfort and comparative plenty.

Each individual would get his just share of the total wealth produced, and the expenses of government would be more than defrayed by the contribution of that annual value which attaches to the land by reason of the aggregation of population upon it. Now is the time for the practice of those eminent virtues

temperance and thrift, for every improvement, whether in themselves or in their methods of working, would result in advantage to the workers. Every man would get his own, no more, no less, and it would be his own, beyond the reach of any monopoly. How could poverty exist here? Only by voluntary idleness, intemperance, unthrift. Those who gave themselves up to bad habits of this kind would go to the wall. The tendency of the entire system would be in the same direction. The evil results which are the necessary product of the existing system would tend to disappear, for under the new system every encouragement to industry, temperance, and thrift would be present.

Now this same tendency would as certainly obtain in all branches of industry, for the relation of labour to land is the same everywhere, though it is less clearly seen in the busy town than in the open country. Make it possible for the lowest form of labour to obtain a fair day's wage for a fair day's work, and you help to do the same thing for the higher forms of labour, and the problem of how to secure an equitable distribution of wealth would soon be solved.

General prosperity would go hand in hand with progress. It would no longer be necessary to spend a hundred millions of money and more in purchasing the necessaries of life from abroad. They could be as readily produced in Great Britain. And a cheap and abundant supply of food would mean a larger and more prosperous population. Every incentive to improvement in the productive arts would exist; accompanying it we should experience a steadily-growing desire for "nobler modes of life," a community of industrious people removed above the fear of want, and regulating their lives like rational beings.

LECTURE XXVII.

RIVAL REMEDIAL PROPOSALS.

Prefatory Observations—How the Landlords have treated the People—How it is Proposed that the People should Treat the Landlords—Direct and Indirect Robbery of the People—The Remedy of Peasant Proprietary—Its Inefficiency—Tending to Extend the Evil of Private Property in Land—Political and Economic Objections—Why the Tories are in Favour of Peasant Proprietary—How this System would still rob the Community—Various other Objections—Would practically Exclude the Labourers from Becoming Landowners—This System but Landlordism in another Form—Dr. Russell Wallace's Remedy—Its Defects—The Financial Reform Association Remedy—Asks People to Demand 4s. in the £ when entitled to 20s.—Only Just and Efficient Remedy in National Ownership of the Fee-Simple of all Land.

IN fulfilment of the promise made in my last lecture, I shall now proceed to the examination of several suggestions at present competing for public approbation as to the best method of dealing with the landlords. But in order that we may approach this task with unbiassed minds, nothing extenuating or setting down aught in malice, let us first of all consider briefly how the landlords have dealt with the people. I must recall to your mind that remarkable sentence of Professor Newman which I have already quoted: "If justice could be wisely and rightly separated from mercy, they (the landlords) might be treated as rudely and curtly as their ancestors under Henry VIII. treated the farmers and peasants whom they massacred and hanged by the roadside." If the learned professor had made that observation in Ireland it would have attracted more attention than it has yet done, for it is a truly remarkable observation, and

presumably was not made at a "tumultuous public meeting" (Richard Cobden's apology for "strong language"), but calmly and dispassionately written down before being spoken and subsequently printed. Manifestly, then, it is worth while to inquire how the landlords have dealt with the people in the past before we consider how the people should deal with the landlords in the present.

There was a time when the land of England was the common property of the people. It was vested in the Crown as trustee for the people. The process by which the land became what it is now, the private property of a class, has been in the main the same in all three kingdoms. But in England the process by which the nation's property has gradually become the landlord's is very clearly traceable. Under the feudal system, the expenses of government were defrayed by the Crown lands, and the barons held their estates subject to the supply of men and money for the services of the Crown in time of need. Magna Charta simply emphasised these arrangements. There was at least one virtue in this system—it made the people valuable in the eyes of the landlords, for a landlord was powerful or otherwise according as he had a large or small number of fighting men at his command. Presently, however, when the military power of the barons had declined, it became their interest to have large rent-rolls rather than large armies of retainers, and they began to eject the people from their farms, and to convert tillage land into sheep-walks. The exportation of wool was a profitable business, and accordingly sheep were more valuable than men. Then came evictions and agrarian discontent. The farmers were "got rid of either by fraud or force," as one historian says; and the landlords changed "rent by custom into rent by competition," "a change," says Professor Newman, "which converted the landlord into a landowner." Thus the appropriation of the people's property went on until at last, in the reign of Charles II., an Act was passed which consummated

the iniquity. The king relieved the landowners of all payments in consideration of a revenue which was to be derived from customs and excise. The Act says, "Be it enacted that the moiety of the excise on beer and cider, perry and strong waters, now levied, shall be settled on the king's majesty, his heirs and successors, as full recompense and satisfaction for all tenures *in capite* and knight service, and of the court of wards and liveries and all emoluments thereby accruing, and in full satisfaction of all purveyance." In 1692, however, a return was made to the old system, and a tax of 4s. in the £ was imposed on the land; but the effect of this measure was quickly nullified, for the landlords, of course in Parliament assembled, fixed two millions as the limit of their tax. The revenue from this source was totally inadequate for governmental purposes, and accordingly taxes, ever increasing in amount, were levied upon industry.

But the way in which the landlords dealt with the people is only half described. Year after year they pursued the policy of enclosing common lands, until it has been estimated that in the thirty-one years from 1783 to 1814 as many as 2253 Enclosure Bills passed through Parliament, by which the landlords took possession of many millions of acres for which they paid absolutely nothing, and which never were included in the land tax. But the landlords have taken that which was not theirs even in another respect. They have succeeded within the period of the present reign in levying a private tax upon agricultural industry and the community of over £20,000,000 a year. "The total increase in this private taxation by landlords is given in Mr. Caird's book on the *Landed Interest*, in which he informs us, at page 133, that the land-rental of England has risen fifty per cent. since 1836; and at page 97 he gives the aggregate land-rental of England alone, as assessed for income tax in 1875, at £50,125,000; or for Great Britain and Ireland at £66,911,000; consequently the equivalent of the advance of fifty per cent. in land-rentals since 1836 is nearly £22,304,000.

"When the Corn Laws were repealed, trade in Great Britain was in such a state of depression that the clamours about interfering with vested interests, and the other Conservative cries of alarm raised then, as now, were not able to maintain such laws, and they had to go at the imperious mandate of public opinion. Before these obnoxious laws were taken off the Statute Book, they yielded the public revenue £4,000,000 annually; and this sum was proved to be such a serious tax upon trade, and so injurious to commerce, that it had to be relinquished by the Government of the day. As soon as the ports of these countries were thrown open to the free admission of food from other lands, the exports of textile productions from England and Scotland began to correspondingly increase. Thus, while exported manufactures continued to bring back, as imports, largely increased supplies of foreign produce in exchange, rents for land continued to increase insidiously, until they have become, according to Caird, £22,000,000 higher than in Corn Law times. Thus the landlords of Great Britain and Ireland, in effect, are now taxing the trade and commerce of these countries nearly six times as much as these obnoxious Corn Laws taxed them in 1844; and this being so, may it not be expected that this will cause the flow in the tide of prosperity to cease, and the ebb to set in? But mark this difference: the £4,000,000 raised through the duty upon imported corn went into the Exchequer of the nation, whereas the £22,000,000 increased annual tax upon agricultural industry goes into the pockets of the landlords."¹

This is the way the landlords have dealt with the people—they have literally stolen their property, both directly and indirectly.

There are three principal proposals before us for dealing with the landlords. One is, that with regard to agricultural land the tenant farmers shall, with the assistance of the public funds,

¹ *Depression of Trade*, by William Lattimer, Carlisle, 1880, p. 9.

purchase the fee simple of their farms. The idea is to increase the number of landowners.

Another proposal is that the State shall purchase the land by giving to the landlords annuities extending over three lives equal in value to their present incomes.

A third proposal is that the land tax of four shillings in the pound shall be levied upon the present valuation of all lands.

I shall venture to make a few observations upon each of these proposals.

The first proposal is to establish a peasant proprietary by purchase on the part of the tenant, aided by public funds. With regard to this, the first and most obvious remark to be made is that it is difficult to see how an increase in the number of those holding private property in land can possibly remedy evils which are so easily traceable to that institution as it already exists. To magnify the cause of an evil is surely an odd way to cure the evil itself. To my mind it is clear that it is not in increasing the number of those holding private property in land that the remedy for the evils of land monopoly lies. Rather does it lie in the abolition of the institution of private property in land altogether.

It is thought that the comparative smallness of the number of landowners enables them to act more as one man in the protection of their "interests" than would be the case supposing the number of landowners enormously increased. But experience shows that self-interest suffices to make very large bodies act together with wonderful unanimity. And it is quite certain that 300,000 or a million peasant proprietors, or petty landlords, would act together as cordially as the present landlord party in the three kingdoms. The voting power of the landlord party at the present time in Great Britain and Ireland is insignificant compared with the voting power of the landless party; yet how much greater is the political power of the former than of the latter? To recruit the ranks of the landlord party by the

establishment of a peasant proprietary, and particularly with public money, is, then, nothing short of suicidal from the point of view of popular liberty. The blandishments of Mr. Bright, as they have been called, are no blandishments at all. It is perfectly true, as the right hon. gentleman has many and many a time insisted, that to create peasant proprietors is to add to the conservative force of any country. The English Tories, who number a few long-headed landlords in their ranks, know this very well, and the moment they succeed to office, we shall find that the public funds will be very liberally used to promote a peasant proprietary, particularly in Ireland, as the best of all possible means of sustaining "the institutions of the country," especially that most glorious of all Tory institutions, private property in land.

Now, I am far from undervaluing conservative forces in society, but I prefer those that make for the welfare of the whole community, to those which make for the welfare of a class at the expense of the community and the peace of society.

But the purely economical objections to peasant proprietary are quite as weighty as the purely political. In the first place, it is a just complaint against the existing system that the landlords appropriate that increased value which attaches to land by reason of the aggregation of population. We have only to ask what have the landed proprietors in the neighbourhood of all the great centres of population in the three kingdoms done that they should become possessed of the great increase in the value of their land in consequence of the growth of these large towns, and the answer is clear. They have done absolutely nothing. And I would ask, in what respect would the case be different if any one of these estates were divided amongst a large number of small proprietors? It appears to me that a tenant farmer, transformed by the aid of the State into a peasant proprietor, would be simply put in possession of a value which he did

finds, further, that no one is willing to lend it to him at three per cent. for thirty-five years. And this leads to the second fact, viz. that peasant proprietary, as advocated in the present day, practically excludes the labourers from all hope of ever being able to elevate themselves from their present degraded condition to anything better in connection with the land. For if one farmer should find a difficulty in purchasing a farm from another, how much more difficult would it be for a labourer to become the owner of a farm? The difficulty is almost insuperable under existing circumstances; it would be entirely so under the system of peasant proprietary. On the other hand, this difficulty is minimised under a system of national ownership, of the fee simple, for the labourer would then have to purchase only the tenant-right, and would enjoy his holding subject to the reduced rent or tax assessed on the value of the land minus improvements. In cases where farms are small and where the tenant-right is not of great value labourers would have an opportunity of becoming farmers, and of thus improving their position.

Peasant proprietorship is simply landlordism in another form. The two systems of land tenure are in essence identical, and for that reason if for no other a remedy for social ills traceable to landlordism need not be looked for in the direction of peasant proprietary. Fatal as this objection is, however, there is another not less fatal. By what right are the public funds or the public credit to be utilised for the benefit of a section of the community merely? If public money or public credit is to be used at all it ought to be for the public good, and not exclusively for the good of a portion of the public only. In short, seeing how the landlords have dealt with the people, it is about the most monstrous proposal that ever was made to appropriate public funds to purchase for one class of the community that which another class has acquired from the nation by force and fraud.

The second proposal for dealing with the landlords is that

made by Mr. Alfred Wallace. That gentleman proposes that a complete valuation of the landed property of the whole kingdom shall be made, and that then a distinction shall be drawn between the inherent value of the land and that which attaches to it by reason of improvements effected by the occupier or owner. The latter, Mr. Wallace proposes, shall remain the property of the landlord, to sell or to retain; the former, however, is to become the property of the State, and the change of ownership is to be effected in this way: Existing landowners and their expectant heirs are to be paid a fixed sum, or secured in the enjoyment of the full revenue from their lands for a fixed term. Says Mr. Wallace, "The principle that seems most consonant with justice is to continue the annuity successively to any heir or heirs of the landowner who may be living at the passing of the Act, and who may be born at any time before the decease of the said owner." The merit of Mr. Wallace's proposal is that it errs on the side of mercy to the landed interest. It is difficult to imagine a more gentle way of letting the landlords down. At the same time it is equally difficult to imagine a scheme more utterly neglectful of the interests of the community at large. The landlords have no claim either in justice or mercy to such considerations as Mr. Wallace proposes to extend to them. It must be remembered that if mercy may not rightly be separated from justice, neither may justice be altogether ignored. And Mr. Wallace approaches perilously near to this in his proposal. The inherent value Mr. Wallace defines as that which attaches to the land by reason of its natural qualities as well as by reason of its contiguity to any considerable town. Surely mercy does not require nor does justice sanction the continuance to several successive lives at all events of that portion of the inherent value which attaches to land by reason of the aggregation of population. Mercy might suggest that the landlord class should not be deprived of what they have been wont to regard as "their property," without some allowance

being made for them; but in justice they are not entitled to a fraction of "their property," which can be plainly shown to be "inherent value." And yet even mercy does not require that we should go to such extravagant lengths as Mr. Wallace's proposal involves. The price is altogether too high. I do not see why we are called upon to do more than guarantee a bare living to the existing landlords and those depending upon them until such time as they may be capable of earning a living for themselves—say until they reach the age of fifteen years. We must put on one side much of the sickly sentimentality to which we are commonly treated in disquisitions upon this subject. It is nonsense to speak of the hardship which it would be to the delicately-nurtured scions of the aristocracy to be compelled to work. There is no hardship in the matter at all in comparison with the hardship involved in the existing social system to the millions who have worked at starvation point from childhood; and if there be any real suffering to the "delicately-nurtured" in the case, it would soon be got over. For the children of the aristocracy, if they were brought up to industrious habits, would soon cease to feel the "hardship" of their lot. Mr. Wallace's plan, therefore, is so far defective and inadequate.

So also is the proposal that a tax of four shillings in the pound should be levied upon all landed property, the proposition for which the Financial Reform Association is responsible. No doubt this would be a step in the right direction and an excellent beginning; but it would only be a beginning, and it would take as much labour, education, and agitation to secure four shillings in the pound as it would to obtain the entire twenty. Suppose land taxed four shillings in the pound, what would be the result? This: The land which is, now kept idle or waste would, to a large extent, become free to the use of labour and for purposes of food production, and would, for a time, afford some relief from the pressure of

population upon the resources of industry.' It would also add some thirty or forty millions annually to the National Exchequer. But these results would inevitably cause popular efforts for a further imposition of the tax to cease until economic conditions should again arise which would necessitate a further demand being made upon the privilege of land monopoly in the interests of labour and subsistence. In the mean time, however, the increase and better distribution of wealth which would follow from such a reform (as happened after the repeal of the Corn Laws), would enable the landlords to put back upon the nation the equivalent of the four shillings tax; just as they have succeeded, since the duty upon imported corn was abolished, in levying a private tax of £22,000,000 a year¹ in the form of increased rents upon the industrial community of Great Britain. We should thus have the struggle against landlordism again renewed; not, however, for a *second* fifth of the annual value of the land, but for the recovery of the *first*.

Under these circumstances, therefore, the full, but just, remedy is that for which all true social reformers should agitate, and that is that the annual value of the land of the nation should fall into the National Exchequer to be used in reduction or abolition of taxation, and in furtherance of the general good of the entire community; and this can only be accomplished by a reform which will completely obviate the necessity of future movements against the pernicious principle of land monopoly, namely, a national proprietary of land.

¹ See page 237.

LECTURE XXVIII.

THE ORGANISATION OF LABOUR.

Existing System of Production and its effect upon the Interests of Labour
 —The Wages of Labour—Similarity in effect between Monopoly in the
 Agencies of Production and Monopoly in Land—Co-operative Pro-
 duction—John St. a. t Mill on Property in Land and Industrial Co-
 operation—How Co-operative Production might be initiated—Indus-
 trial Partnerships inadequate—Whi more Collieries Experiment a
 failure—Maison Leclaire more successful—Only final solution of
 Labour Question in complete Co-operative Production.

It is a wise saying, "You do take my life if you do take the means whereby I live;" and that this is so is nowhere more perfectly illustrated than in the monopoly of land. Ready access to the gifts of nature is essential to human well-being. Scarcely less essential is it that every human being should have the entire result of his own labour when applied to the gifts of nature. We have seen that so long as land is held as private property, access to the gifts of nature is practically denied to the mass of mankind, except upon such terms as the owners of the land are pleased to name. We have seen, also, that the monopoly of land is the efficient cause of the tendency of wages to the minimum of a bare living. And now it is not difficult to see that so long as the land of a country is the private property of a class, it must follow, "as the night the day," that those who labour can never receive as wages the entire produce of their labour. A very considerable part of the produce of labour must go to those who enjoy a monopoly of the land; and another

considerable part to those who stand between the landowners and the labourers, viz. the employers of labour.

No one can doubt that under the existing system of production the wages of the workers represent the least that employers are compelled to give; and equally no one can doubt that the least that employers are compelled to give is very far from being that to which workers are justly entitled. No question can arise that in a fair market the market-price of any commodity is the just price. But who will say that the labour market, under existing conditions, is a fair market? Labour is constrained to take what it can get, but who will venture to affirm that what it can get is what it ought to get?

I have already pointed out that the abolition of land monopoly, in destroying the power of holding land for speculative values, would practically result in a sharp competition between employers and labourers instead of the present cut-throat competition between labourers for work. At present the vast accumulations of capital in the hands of employers virtually operates in much the same way as the monopoly of land in the hands of a class. Great capitalists are able to hold for lower wages or higher profits, just as great landowners are able to hold for higher prices. And the question is, how can we effect such social arrangements as will result in a fair day's wages for a fair day's work—in other words, in the payment to the worker of his full equivalent for the work done by him? To me it appears that the answer to this question is to be found in the direction of co-operative production. The late John Stuart Mill, as any thoughtful student of his *Principles of Political Economy* may see, entertained the presentiment, if not the conviction, that the solution of social evils lay in the direction of making the land the common property of a community and in a system of industrial co-operation. In regard to the land, Mill says, "The essential principle of property being to assure to all persons what they have produced by their labour and accumulated by their

abstinence, this principle cannot apply to what is not the produce of labour, the raw material of the earth. If the land derived its productive power wholly from nature and not at all from industry, or if there were any means of discriminating what is derived from each source, it not only would not be necessary, but it would be the height of injustice, to let the gift of nature be engrossed by individuals." In the same chapter of his great work Mr. Mill conclusively shows that private property in land, so far as England is concerned, "is very far from completely fulfilling the conditions which render its existence economically justifiable." And he adds: "In Ireland those conditions are not complied with at all." That remark is as perfectly true to-day as it was on the day when the distinguished economist placed it on record, and it is a happy circumstance that its truth is becoming more and more widely recognised. It is generally admitted by all thoughtful men, "when the 'sacredness of property' is talked of," "that any such sacredness does not belong in the same degree to landed property," and the following sentences, which at the time of their first publication were no doubt regarded as embodying merely the "pious opinions" of a social visionary, are now regarded as the statement of fundamental truths: "No man made the land. It is the original inheritance of the whole species. Its appropriation is wholly a question of expediency. When private property in land is not expedient it is unjust."¹ I remember well the effect which a first reading of these sentences produced upon my mind. To me they seemed the articles of a new social charter, and lapse of time and calmer consideration have, but deepened and strengthened my conviction that Mr. Mill's mind was steadily travelling in a direction that would certainly have led him to declare the monopoly of land to be the fruitful source of social ills.

Not less clear is it that Mr. Mill looked to co-operative

¹ *Principles of Political Economy*, Book II. ch. ii.

production for a solution of the problem how to secure to every worker a fair day's wages for a fair day's work. He writes: "In the co-operative movement, the permanency of which may now be considered as insured, we see exemplified the process of bringing about a change in society, which would combine the freedom and independence of the individual with the moral, intellectual, and commercial advantages of aggregate production; and which, without violence or spoliation, or even any other sudden disturbance of existing habits and speculations, would realise, at least in the industrial department, the best aspirations of the democratic spirit, by putting an end to the division of society into the industrious and the idle, and effacing all social distinctions but those fairly earned by personal services and exertions.

"Associations like those we have described (viz. co-operative societies as they existed twenty or thirty years ago—that is, mainly for purposes of distribution—and industrial partnerships of the Leclaire and Briggs' type), by the very process of their success, are a course of education in those moral and active qualities by which alone success can be either preserved or attained. As associations multiplied they would tend more and more to absorb all workpeople, except those who have too little understanding or too little virtue to be capable of learning to act on any other system than that of narrow selfishness. As this change proceeded, owners of capital would gradually find it to their advantage, instead of maintaining the struggle of the old system with workpeople of only the worst description, to lend their capital to the associations; to do this at a diminishing rate of interest, and at last, perhaps, even to exchange their capital for terminable annuities. In this or some such mode, the existing accumulations of capital might honestly, and by a kind of spontaneous process, become in the end the joint property of all who participate in their productive employment, a transformation which, thus effected (and assuming, of course, that both

sexes participate equally in the rights and in the government of the association), would be the nearest approach to social justice, and the most beneficial ordering of industrial affairs for the universal good, which it is possible at present to foresee.”¹

It is impossible not to admire the cautious spirit pervading Mr. Mill's suggestions in reference to the means which might in his view be honestly used to bring about the change from individual ownership to common ownership of both land and capital. It appears to me that he saw very clearly the conclusions to which his reasoning pointed, but that he shrank from declaring them in plain terms, preferring to content himself with indicating the direction in which his conclusions would reveal themselves, and offering in the mean time a suggestion as to how the end he had in view might be reached almost surreptitiously.

Having regard to all the forces which operate in society, the virtual omnipotence of vested interests and the firm hold which the doctrine of “every one for himself and the devil take the hindmost” has upon the popular mind, it is perhaps wise of social reformers to follow the line of the least resistance, and present their views as insinuatingly as may be. But the time has now come for declaring that in a common ownership of the land and the means of production is most certainly to be found the “nearest approach to social justice and the most beneficial ordering of industrial affairs for the universal good.”

We cannot say of capital, however, that no man made it; and it appears to me, therefore, that the community would have no such justification for boldly appropriating existing accumulations of capital as exists for the appropriation of land. We should rather aim at preventing these great accumulations of capital in few hands by adopting a system of production the reverse of that which now prevails, and by virtue of which these great accumulations are possible. Instead of a hundred or

¹ *Principles of Political Economy*, B. IV. ch. vii. § 6.

a thousand workers working for one employer, who by reason of the monopoly of land and his command of capital is able to fix the rate of wages, we should aim at constituting a hundred or a thousand workmen their own employers. And the thing is very simple. All you have to do is, first, to destroy the monopoly of land by taxing it all up to its full value—exclusive of improvements. The immediate result of this would be a rise in wages from the minimum of a bare living, for which the worker is now forced to work, to the maximum which an employer would be willing to pay. As a consequence the wages of the workers would more closely approximate to their earnings, and they would be able to devote a portion of their wages to the accumulation of a capital fund which would enable them to enter upon a co-operative enterprise in which they would be their own employers, and their wages exactly equivalent to their earnings.

It must be frankly conceded, however, that the day is somewhat remote when co-operation or collectivism may be expected completely to displace competition or individualism. I believe, nevertheless, that the day will surely come when self-interest will no longer be the great motive power of human enterprise. John Stuart Mill is probably right in affirming that Socialists are in error in so far as they "charge upon competition all the economical evils which at present exist;" but in my humble judgment Mr. Mill is himself in error in estimating competition so highly as he does. "They" (the Socialists), he says, "forget that wherever competition is not monopoly is." Surely the fact is patent to the simplest observation, that in the existing order of society competition emphatically *is*, and monopoly no less emphatically *is*, also. Co-operation, and not competition, is the real enemy of monopoly. And while I would not deny that competition, within certain limitations, has its advantages, I would venture to hope that in the time to come all the virtues which are commonly supposed to lurk in that principle may be

found to arise far more abundantly from the simple endeavour of enlightened men and women to play their part in the social economy as rational beings. How much longer are we to drag the banner of human progress in the mire of self-interest and cut-throat competition? How much longer are the apostles of humanity to be guilty of atheism? We are taught to believe that God is Love; yet we are at the same time asked to believe that the children of God must needs each seek his own. I for one repudiate this doctrine, and affirm that not in self-interest, but in self-sacrifice, not in competition, but in co-operation lies the most beneficent motive power of human progress, and to this let us for the future appeal. "Knowledge comes, but wisdom lingers," it is true, and we may be well aware of the right path long before we are courageous enough to walk in it; but if history has any lesson to teach it is this—that it is high time to cease stoning the prophets and commence following them.

Already a beginning has been made. Industrial partnerships, as they are called, are a step in the right direction. They proceed on the lines of least resistance, and alarm no one. Yet it must be said that so far as the system of profit sharing has yet been developed, it only serves to show that the ultimate and only really satisfactory system must be that in which the workers engage on equal terms, and jointly own the means necessary for the successful prosecution of a given industry. In such industrial partnerships as I have been able to study the management has been vested more or less absolutely in the employers, so that, as in the Whitwood Collieries, for example, the relation of employer and employed has still subsisted. Such profit-sharing as there was in this instance was wholly dependent on the good will of the Messrs. Briggs. No doubt these gentlemen were actuated by the simplest motives, but it is very clear that they always recognised that their first duty was to the shareholders. Profits were "shared" only after a certain amount was made, and the scheme resolved itself into a device

for inducing the colliers to ensure more regular profits to the owners of the collieries. Indeed, it was publicly claimed that the system of profit-sharing adopted in this instance would "increase rather than diminish the dividend to the shareholders."

In many other partially successful instances of the application of this principle the same features of absolute control on the part of the employers and increased advantage to them are present. But it is distinctly noteworthy that the instances in which the application of the principle has been attended with the most striking success have been those in which these features have been gradually modified. Probably in the Maison Leclaire we have the most conspicuously successful illustration of the application of the principle of profit-sharing, and it is in this case that we have the nearest approach to co-operative production with which I am familiar. Even in this instance, however, "the business direction of the house is placed exclusively in the hands of the two managing partners, who hold half the capital, and undertake personal liability for losses, which does not attach to the workmen, except in an indirect manner through their interest in the reserve fund."¹ A thoroughly successful example of the perfect application of the principle of co-operative production, therefore, remains to be revealed. The complete organisation of industry on the basis of joint ownership of capital and absolute control on the part of the workers is a thing of the future. That this should be the end to be kept clearly in view I am satisfied. The first and most necessary means to this end is to abolish land monopoly. Thus by removing the cause of the tendency of wages to the minimum of a bare living workers will be in a position to exact their whole earnings, instead of the moiety, or even less, which they now receive; and they will then have but to set apart a portion of their earnings as capital, and combine in the

¹ *Profit Sharing*, ch. i. Sedley Taylor, M.A.

employment of their own capital and labour in any given industrial enterprise. Some time must elapse, no doubt, before the blessings of education will be so widely diffused as to render the workers, as a whole, equal to the management of any considerable number of great concerns; but in the ranks of the working classes, to my own personal knowledge, are to-day to be found many men quite equal to the work requiring to be done. Is it not reasonable to predict, therefore, that ere long examples of the successful application of the genuine principle of co-operative production will present themselves in sufficient numbers to lead the industrial classes, with growing persistence, to look in this direction for their emancipation from their present state of dependence?

LECTURE XXIX.

STATE SOCIALISM.

State Organisation *versus* State Regulation of Labour—Individualism *versus* Communism—Growth of State Socialism—Beneficial Results—Comparative Risks of Labour and Capital—Insurance on Workmen's Lives should be paid out of Profits of Capital—Necessity for further State Regulation—Co-operative Functions of Municipalities—Natural Evolution of State Functions.

THE organisation of labour, on the principles laid down in my last lecture, if it could be carried out to any considerable extent, would have the effect of directing attention very steadily to what must be the ultimate solution of the social question, viz. the independence of labour, an equitable distribution of the wealth produced by labour, and State ownership of the raw materials to which labour must be applied. It is greatly to be desired that some earnest attempts at such an organisation of labour as that indicated should be made at once; for, after all, the human mind is intensely practical, and the question with regard to any scheme, no matter how theoretically perfect it may be, always is, How does it work? Indeed, it must be frankly admitted that it is not desirable to make great changes without ascertaining as far as possible how the proposed changes will work. The undiscovered country naturally puzzles the will.

The organisation of labour in a few cases on the principle already referred to would have the further advantage of indicating how far the idea of the State organisation of labour is practicable or not. For my own part, I am bound to admit

that the difficulties in the way of the realisation of such an idea appear to me to be so enormous that social reformers would do wisely to direct their attention, for the present at all events, rather to the State regulation of labour. It will be through State regulation that we shall obtain State organisation of labour, if we ever do attain to such a thing, for regulation imperceptibly shades into organisation.

A careful observation of the existing social system goes far to show that there is a distinct tendency in the direction of a golden mean between the extremes of individualism and communism. We have a large body of legislation directed to the regulation of the relations between labour and capital; and we have many great enterprises, either under the supervision, or altogether in the hands of local or Imperial authorities. The famous dictum of the Utilitarian School, "the greatest good of the greatest number," is steadily disrupting the philosophy of selfishness, which asks, "May I not do as I will with my own?" It is conceded on every hand that the interest of the individual is subordinate to the interest of the community, and recent history is full of instances showing that when the two interests clash the former goes to the wall. And there is happily also a growing feeling that the compensation of individuals for the subordination of their interest to that of the community must be confined for the future within more reasonable limits than has heretofore been customary. We may take it, therefore, that with the growth of popular enlightenment and popular power, we shall see further developments in the same direction. It is the line of the least resistance; in other words, it is the natural course of events; and social reformers would in my judgment do well to exert themselves to extend the application of the principle of the State regulation of the relation between labour and capital and governmental control and ownership of enterprises similar in character to those which are already subject to such supervision or ownership. We need not be alarmed by

the cry that State regulation of industry is in restraint of trade. So far as the principle has yet been applied, it has on the whole been productive of very great good; and it is not unreasonable to assume that it is capable of much wider application with corresponding advantage. Of course it would be exceedingly beneficial if we could hit upon some well-defined limits within which the principle might be permitted to work freely; but after giving much earnest thought to the subject, I am free to confess that I have no better rule to offer than this—that every case must be decided on its own merits. Where it can be clearly shown that the application of the principle of State regulation would be distinctly for the general good of the community, there the principle should be boldly applied. Where there is any doubt about it, there we should do well to wait for fuller light.

To my mind, for example, though I freely admit my early experiences may incline me to take a partial view of the matter, workers might well demand much more drastic measures of compensation for injuries sustained in the prosecution of their employment than they are now entitled to receive. For, after all, the risks of capital, of which we hear so much, are as nothing in comparison with the risks of labour, of which we hear so little. The risks that are run every day and every hour by workers in coal-mines, and indeed in almost all trades, are risks of life and limb. But what are the risks which a colliery owner or a factory owner or a railway shareholder runs? They are never risks of life and limb, but always risks that are reducible to a minimum by prudence and foresight. No amount of these qualities, however, on the part of ninety-nine out of a hundred colliers or factory hands or railway *employés* can shield them from the folly of the hundredth man, or the neglect of an employer to observe the most elementary precautions against disaster. Workers, then, I say, might with perfect propriety insist that the State should go much further than it has already

gone in the way of making employers liable for injuries sustained by their workmen, unless it can be clearly proved that the injury has resulted from the negligence of the person injured. It is a distinct hardship that a man or a boy, from no fault of his own, should be maimed for life and cast upon the world without the means of livelihood ; and it is a still greater hardship when the head of a family is struck down, leaving behind him a number of young children totally unprovided for. The capitalist who takes from his enterprise a yearly sum often equal to the aggregate wages of his workers, may be fairly, I think, called upon to set aside a much larger proportion of his income than he now does as a sort of insurance fund upon which his workers may draw in such cases as I have mentioned. It is idle to say that a workman should be provident, and should set aside a portion of his own earnings to meet such cases, for, in the first place, under existing arrangements, no workman gets what he earns ; and in the second place, what he does get amounts on the average to no more than a bare subsistence. Thrift is an excellent social virtue, but so far as the great body of the working classes is concerned its practice is all but impossible. I am quite aware that pages of statistics can be adduced to show that the working classes are much better off now than was formerly the case ; but I take my facts from actual experience amongst the working classes ; and the net result of my observation is that not one workman in five is in a position to save a sum of money equal to the necessity occasioned by his permanent disablement or death. And, besides, to throw the responsibility upon the workman in such a case as that to which I am referring, is to beg the whole question. If it were in the pursuit of his own interest alone that he sustained injury or met with death, something might be said as to the obligation resting upon him to make provision for such contingencies. But the workman unhappily is generally promoting the interest of his employer rather than his own, and upon the employer therefore

rests, in my judgment, the obligation to set aside, as a first charge upon profits, an annual sum for the purpose mentioned.

In the matter of the hours of labour, the employment of women and children, sanitary inspection, and other kindred matters, there is ample scope for a beneficial extension of the principle of State regulation. For it is obvious that though the organisation of labour would render the workers less and less liable to the tyranny of capital, it would afford no guarantee against either overwork or work under unwise conditions. It is quite conceivable, indeed, that a community of workers owning their own capital, and being in fact their own employers, might be worse tyrants to themselves, their women and children, than even the most grasping capitalists of the present day. Competition between co-operative associations or organised industrial communities, would tend to produce evils as great as any resulting from competition between capitalist employers of labour. Therefore the interference of the State would be as imperatively called for as now. Regulation of industry would be necessarily carried to its extremest point, and it would be more clearly seen to what extent it would be desirable to make the complete organisation of industry a function of the State.

My own conviction is, that the common sense of the community will prove to be the co-ordinating power which socialist philosophers aver must be developed as the social organism becomes more complex. I doubt whether it will ever be necessary for the State to become a universal employer in the sense in which I think it should become a universal landlord. For once labour discovers that it may make capital its instrument by the principle of association, and thus secure to itself the entire produce of its exertions; and once the gifts of nature by being vested in the State are free to all under equal conditions, I am convinced that "the common sense of most" will suffice to secure all that will remain to be secured. The common sense of the community will dictate the conditions

under which industry should be pursued, and the further interference of the State will be rendered unnecessary. And happily we need have no fear of the growth of common sense, nor of its sufficiency as the co-ordinating power of an increasingly complex social system. There is undoubtedly much to deplore in the condition of society to-day—enough perhaps to drive men of strong passions to a despairing resort to the resources of savagery for a radical remedy; but to men of stronger faith it is clear that there are moral forces at work portending peaceful revolutions more mighty than any the world has known since the dawn of Christianity. To all true reformers the growth of popular enlightenment is a source of supreme satisfaction, for it is the one power which is sufficient to cope with social ills.

The function of the State is much less disputed in regard to the regulation of such matters as have a more distinctly apprehended relation to the welfare of the community. If we glance at the duties discharged by the local authorities, or the governments of the larger and more enlightened towns of the three kingdoms, we see that there is a rapidly-increasing tendency in the direction of co-operative association. In many of the great towns the gas and water-works are the property of the corporation. Public schools, libraries, parks, baths, and workhouses, are among municipal institutions. The corporation not only lights but paves the streets, and drains the town. Some corporations even provide their constituents with gas cooking-stoves. In England and Scotland local authorities employ and control the police. And so far has this tendency to multiply the duties of corporations extended, that some years ago Mr. Chamberlain proposed that the town of Birmingham should acquire and work all the public-houses.¹

¹ At the time of writing, I have before me the prospectus of a singularly interesting enterprise, of which the midland metropolis is the scene. A company has been formed for the supply of compressed air, through mains and pipes, over a considerable area of the town. The expectation is that many small manufacturers will avail themselves of the motive power thus

The truth is that it is impossible to lay down any hard and fast line as the limit of State regulation or enterprise. The principle underlying all these functions which municipalities now discharge, is that the enterprises which are subject to regulation, or are directly owned by corporations, are either of the nature of monopolies, or are monopolies pure and simple. Public utility alone dictates when and to what extent all such partial or complete monopolies shall be under the control or entirely in the hands of municipalities. And it is not likely that corporations will shrink from extending their functions in this respect. The growing complexity of the social system is matched at all events by the growing capacity of communities. The question is very simple—What reason have we to suppose that the people of this generation are not equal to their duties? No municipality has yet gone so far as to propose to acquire the land upon which the town is built, but I cannot believe that the day is far distant when some daring spirit will propose that the corporation of some large town should acquire the land upon which it stands, and devote the revenue to the benefit of its citizens.

supplied, and that it will ultimately be availed of by builders and contractors, by owners of fire-pumps, by tramcar companies, and that it will be used for a great variety of purposes: such as ventilating noxious spaces, blowing organs, and the production of electricity. The company has entered into an agreement with the corporation, by which it binds itself to keep a constant supply of power, and to supply on demand any one within reasonable distance of the mains. Profits are regulated under the scheme to the extent that none are to be divided beyond ten per cent., until fifty per cent. of the profits beyond that amount have been applied to the reduction of rates and charges. Provision is also made for the acquirement of the undertaking by the corporation after the lapse of a certain time, and if the company cease for twelve consecutive months to use any of the pipes put down they become the property of the corporation. If this enterprise should succeed—and it is but a new form of what has already been done with gas—may we not expect that, if ever electricity takes the place which many people believe it is destined to take in our social economy, corporations will not only light factories and streets, but furnish motive power in them? In the face of facts like these who will define the limits of the co-operative functions of corporations?

And when our survey of the enterprises, which are admittedly functions of State, is further extended, we find that prisons, hospitals, asylums, armies, dockyards, libraries, museums, telegraphs, are all owned by the State, which also distributes letters and parcels through a vast postal organisation, and saves the people's money in its post-office savings' banks, and insures their lives even by the same agency. Indeed, it is almost as difficult to say what the State already does, as to say what it may not be expected to do in the near future. So far the State has never relinquished its primary right in the land, and it may be expected ere long to go very great lengths in the way of regulating the tenure of land. The Irish Land Act of 1881 is but a prelude to English and Scotch Land Acts, which will put Agricultural Holdings Acts and Irish Land Acts completely in the shade. Whenever the English and Scottish people come to deal with the land question as a question involving something more than an adjustment of relationships between landlord and tenant, they will hardly be content with such a measure as they thought should satisfy "the mere Irish." Already "the landed" betray a nervous anxiety to secure places of refuge in America and the Colonies. They have an instinctive feeling that State regulation of the tenure of land will merge very rapidly into State ownership of land. Once let it be made quite clear that "landlords" are reduced to the level of mere pensioners, and the thing will be done. There is a strong feeling against the pension list as it now stands. It has but to be augmented to be swept away.

So far, again, the State has confined itself in these countries, at all events, to the regulation of railways. But it is very plain that public opinion is steadily growing in favour of the acquisition of these great properties by the State, so as to cheapen the cost of travel and goods transit for the community.¹

¹ Curiously enough, in a recent Irish Act we see State control merging into State ownership in a very significant manner. The Tramways Act

The arguments which may be adduced in favour of the State ownership of the postal and telegraph services apply with tenfold force to the acquisition of the railways by the State. It is perfectly true that the railways of England and Scotland are not a complete monopoly in the sense in which the land is; but they are a practical monopoly of the most flagrant character, and the community would undoubtedly derive many and great advantages from their transference to the State. They should be a means of public income, and might readily be made to supply the place of a much less creditable source of revenue, the liquor traffic, which a good many people think all respectable governments should be glad to get rid of.

I have in previous lectures laid down the lines upon which the State should go in matters of education, and also in reference to the land; and it is not necessary to do more now than to say that in regard to the functions of the State, and especially in reference to the limits of State regulation of industry, or supervision or ownership of enterprises that either approximate to or are complete monopolies, no one can pronounce a dogmatic opinion. No one can say absolutely what is and what is not the duty of the State. It is for every successive generation in any given community to say what duties shall be discharged independently by individuals or collectively by the State. With growing intelligence on the part of the people we may fairly expect a wider comprehension of common interests, and a consequent extension of the area of State control; and it is, therefore, in earnest painstaking effort to advance popular education,

provides for a baronial guarantee of a dividend of five per cent. to those who will advance capital for the construction of tramways. But if at any time the Tramway Company should fail, then the Grand Jury of the county are charged with the management of the enterprise at the expense of the guarantors. If a straw will show the way the wind blows, we may take it that we have in the Tramways (Ireland) Act a measure embodying the State ownership principle in a more pronounced form even than any other measure relating to internal communications. The acquirement of the railways by the State is, therefore, merely a matter of time.

that we may bring the workers of all countries to see in what direction their highest interests may be most safely and surely sought; in equally earnest and painstaking effort to organise and direct popular power, that the popular will may find most clear and emphatic expression; and in unceasing endeavours to simplify the methods of government, by separating what is local from what is general, that both local and general governments may be equal to the due discharge of the additional functions which the near future has in store for them; it is, I say, upon efforts of this character that social reformers would do most wisely to expend their energies. It is, I repeat, the line of the least resistance, or the natural course of events. It is the path illumined by the Star of Hope. If we pursue it faithfully for a single generation even, those who come after us, realising the advantages of co-operative association seen in the possession by the State of a vast body of common property held and directed for the common welfare, will wonder that we could have hesitated at all in doing that the very mention of which now excites the smile of derision.

LECTURE XXX.

STATE OWNERSHIP OF RAILWAYS.

Professor Jevons on the Functions of the State in relation to the State Ownership of Railways—Objections considered.

If any objection is offered to what has been so far advanced, it is most likely to be directed against the suggestions that land should be constituted the common property of the people, and that the railways should be owned by the State. I have already so far anticipated the objections that may be raised to a national proprietorship of land, that it is not necessary to pursue that matter any further now. It is desirable, however, to attempt some answer to objections raised against the acquisition of the railways by the State. The late Professor Jevons is the most vigorous opponent of the proposal, with whose writings I am familiar, and an address delivered by that gentleman about ten years ago, and published at the time, embodies, I believe, all that there is to be said against the acquisition of the railways by the State.¹ Mr. Jevons is not altogether opposed to the extension of the functions of Government, for he was one of the most powerful advocates of the Government purchase of the telegraphs and the establishment of a parcels post. So far back as 1867, in a paper read at a meeting of the Manchester Statistical Society, Mr. Jevons gave it as his own "strong opinion" that "no abstract principle and no absolute rule can guide us in determining what kinds of industrial enterprise the State should undertake, and what it should not. . . . Nothing but experience

¹ This address, with some others, has since been republished in a volume entitled *Methods of Social Reform*.

and argument from experience can in most cases determine whether the community will be best served by its collective State action, or by trusting to private self-interest." And many years later, in a most admirable little work—*The State in Relation to Labour*—Mr. Jevons unhesitatingly declared with regard to the grounds and limits of legislation: "I conceive that the State is justified in passing any law, or even in doing any single act which, without ulterior consequences, adds to the sum-total of happiness. Good done is sufficient justification of any act, in the absence of evidence that equal or greater evil will subsequently follow." It would be a fair representation of Mr. Jevons' views to say that he was not in principle opposed to State control of the railways, or any other enterprise so closely approximating to a monopoly; but that he was very firm in demanding that the case for their acquisition should be made out with as near an approach to perfection as possible. There appeared to him to be "four principal conditions under which State management of any branch of industry" could be successful, and therefore justifiable. These were as follows:

"1. The work must be of an invariable and routine-like nature, so as to be performed according to fixed rules.

"2. It must be performed under the public eye, and for the service of individuals who will immediately detect and expose any failure or laxity.

"3. There must be very little capital expenditure, so that each year's revenue and expense account shall represent with approximate accuracy the real commercial success of the undertaking.

"4. The operations must be of such a kind that their union under one all-extensive government monopoly will lead to great advantage and economy."

Mr. Jevons was willing to admit that so far as all these conditions save the third were concerned, they might reasonably be expected to be fulfilled in the State management of the railways. The third condition, he felt, presented an insuperable obstacle.

I confess I am quite unable to see why it should necessarily be so. Mr. Jevons lays much stress upon the fact that the State paid a premium of about a hundred per cent. in effecting the compulsory purchase of the telegraphs, and he asks us to contemplate the prospect before us if we should venture upon the acquisition of the railways with their vast capital, amounting to not less than £600,000,000. It appears to me little short of absurd to expect that any Government would acquire railways on any such terms as are here suggested. I am not prepared to say that the railways should be simply taken over by the State without purchase, but I have no hesitation whatever in declaring that any such thing as compensation for compulsory purchase is altogether out of the question. The institution of terminable annuities, estimated with due regard to the fact that the annuitants would have the security of the Government for their payment, might meet the case, and it must always be remembered that the railway property of these three kingdoms is scarcely a whit less dependent for its value upon the industry of the people than is the land. The railway companies have enjoyed for many years the privilege of levying a heavy toll upon industry, and they have taken very good care to compete with each other only in the effort to discover at what point they had better cease to compete. The community will have scrupulous regard to facts of this character when the time comes for converting railway shareholders into holders of terminable annuities, and transferring the management of the different railway systems to the governments of the three countries. The objection that the cost of effecting the transfer renders the proposal for ever impossible is therefore invalid. The railway companies will have to submit to be dealt with in such a way as the community thinks fit. For it is exactly as Mr. Jevons himself declares: "It may be fearlessly said that no social transformation would be too great to be commended and attempted if only it could be clearly shown to lead to the greater happiness of the

community. No scheme of Bellew, or Babeuf, or Robert Owen could be resisted if only their advocates could adduce scientific evidence of their practicability and good tendency. No laws, no customs, no rights of property are so sacred that they may not be made away with if it can be clearly shown that they stand in the way of the greatest happiness. *Salus populi suprema lex.*"¹

Now, Mr. Jevons frankly admits that there would be many advantages in State control. The objections are mainly two: first, that it would realise very few of the prodigious advantages anticipated from it; and second, that it would probably be a disastrous financial speculation. With regard to the first of these objections, it appears to me that its whole force lies in the word prodigious, and I see no reason why the community should look for any such advantages. It might well be content with such advantages as satisfy existing shareholders, and such additional advantages as Mr. Jevons himself admits would accrue from State ownership, such as "the union of all railways in one complete system," allowing of "much economy in superintendence, in the use of the rolling stock, the avoidance of competing trains," "the arrangement of rates of passenger and goods traffic in regard to the interests of the people rather than the interests of shareholders," and so forth; not to speak of the unquestionable advantage of obtaining for the community that increment of value inevitable in prosperous and progressive countries. It is very easy to draw up a catalogue of "prodigious advantages," and then object to the acquisition of railways by the State, because such advantages are impossible of realisation; but to do so does not really affect the argument.

The second objection is not more real than the first. I see no reason to suppose that State control of railways "would probably be a disastrous financial operation." Mr. Jevons' reason for supposing so is that the vast amount of capital involved, "represented by property of the most varied and complicated character," destroys all analogy to the post office; and he says, "if we want

¹ *The State in Relation to Labour*, pp. 11, 12.

to know how the Government would manage such a property we should look not to the post office, which owns no property of any consequence, but to the Admiralty, which holds the dockyards and maintains a large fleet, or to the department of public works." And we are then treated to a melancholy disquisition on the iniquities of these departments. But it is most surprising to me that Mr. Jevons, who is ordinarily most scrupulously careful of his analogies, should have overlooked the fact that the dockyards and the department of public works, though they involve a vast expenditure on capital account, differ from the railways in a very important particular. The work they do is not "performed under the public eye, or for the service of individuals, who will immediately detect and expose any failure or laxity." If this condition applied to the dockyards and the department of public works, it is at least open to question whether they would continue to be guilty of that wasteful expenditure of public money with which they are now generally charged. Mr. Jevons frankly allows, with regard to the railways, that "the larger part of the traffic can be carried on according to a pre-arranged and published time-table, so that the public, whether in travelling or transmitting goods, will have apparently as good a means as in the post office of scrutinising the efficiency of the department and exposing any laxity." It is strange that Mr. Jevons should not have observed that in this respect there was practically all the difference in the world between the dockyards and the railways. But it may safely be said that, in so far as the validity of the second objection depends upon the perfection of the analogy between the dockyards and the railways, it is sufficiently rebutted when it is shown that the analogy fails in the vital point I have specified. But I may go yet further, and point out that after all capital expenditure is only a question of degree, and that, when there is a department like the post office, subject to close and popular supervision, and involving a tolerably large expenditure, working satisfactorily in every

respect, it may be safely assumed that, all other things being equal, we may proceed further in the same direction, even to the length of constituting the railways a department of the State. It is not a valid objection that simply by reason of their becoming a Government department the finances of the railways would get into confusion. That, as Mr. Jevons affirms, "no English Government department has ever yet furnished a real balance-sheet" is no argument against the State acquisition of railways, but rather an argument for the reform of Government departments. It might even be argued that it would be well to constitute the railways a department of the State if for no other purpose than to have at least one department that could present a balance-sheet, for it would be idle to suppose that the moment the railways become public property the officials would all turn rogues, and present the nation with unreal balance-sheets.

Indeed, it may be said generally that all the objections urged by Mr. Jevons are based upon the assumption that there is in a Government department some necessary inefficiency. Now, I am quite ready to admit that Government departments are not what they should be. Nor are they what they might be. Nor, again, are they what they will be in the very near future. As the masses of people grow in competence to appoint governments, governments and government departments will increase in efficiency. Then things that may be regarded as impracticable now will be found to be perfectly practicable. At all events we may hope that then some way will be found of giving practical effect to proposals the theoretical soundness of which Mr. Jevons himself does not venture to dispute. "The general conclusion at which I arrive," he says, "concerning the schemes of Government purchase is that they are impracticable." He does not say they are bad in principle. And his conclusion that they are impracticable must be accepted, if Government departments are necessarily corrupt and incompetent and not subject to efficient supervision, and if in purchasing the railways the

State must necessarily pay double their market value, or even the "market value" itself. But these are altogether arbitrary and totally inadmissible assumptions, and the reasoning of which they form the basis is accordingly inconsequential.

But there is another objection of quite a different character of which some notice must be taken. It is, that to constitute the railways a department of Government would be to place in the hands of the Minister and officials in charge of the department an amount of political influence so large that it could not fail to be a source of political corruption. There is no doubt that an increase of officialism of the kind that is now so common is not a thing to be desired. But my contention is that officialism tends to improvement with every improvement in the body politic; and particularly with reference to officialism of the special type connected with those departments of the public service that most directly touch the people, do I think we may rest assured that corruption would be reduced to a minimum. In any case, however, it is doubtful if there could possibly be placed in the hands of any Minister a power equal to that which is exercised by the railways now. If the railways were a department of Government, the power of the Minister would on the whole be exercised in the interest of the community, since "Her Majesty's Opposition" would carefully watch "Her Majesty's Government," and bring before the great tribunal of public opinion any political jobbery which might be attempted for individual or party purposes.

But as matters now stand, the power of the railways is practically unlimited, and it is wholly directed to serve the interests of the shareholders. We have really no adequate idea of the enormous influence which the railway interest exercises in these countries. But recent experience has brought to light the fact that big interests can practically paralyse parliaments, and overthrow governments when they are pleased to do so. When Mr. Gladstone was thrown out of office in 1874, it was

admittedly because his "five great legislative achievements" had interfered with as many "great interests."¹

Although things may not be quite as bad here as they are in the United States, still everything points to the conclusion that either the State must manage the railways or the railways will manage the State. That is the conclusion at which Mr. Henry George and many other eminent men have already arrived with regard to this question in America, and I confess it seems to me that these countries are scarcely less completely in the power of the railways than are the United States of America. Instead, then, of being alarmed that the power which a Railway Minister might exercise would tend to corruption, we should do wisely to ask whether the railway interest, as it at present exists, is not only one of a dangerous political character, but a kindred interest to that of a monopoly antagonistic to the general interests of the nation, and on these grounds a subject for an immediate legislative remedy.

A careful balancing of considerations forces the conclusion that the acquisition of the railways by the State is perfectly practicable; and that it would be conducive in the highest degree to the welfare of the community, and that it ought therefore to be done with the least possible delay. Places of rest and recreation now beyond the means of working men to reach during the summer months, could be made accessible under a State control of the railways, which would look to the benefit of the industrial masses instead of the dividends of non-productive shareholders. Cheaper fares than those now imposed upon the public, and lower rates of goods transit, would necessarily follow from this advance in State socialism.

¹ Only lately we have seen how the shipping interest can stand in the way of legislation. All Mr. Chamberlain's suavity is thrown away upon an "interest" which has self for its object; and any one who should say that ultimately the interests of the shipowners and railway shareholders must be identical with the interests of the community at large, has only, it appears to me, to look at what has happened to the Merchant Shipping Bill to be convinced that they are talking arrant nonsense.

LECTURE XXXI.

GOVERNMENT BY PRIVILEGE AND WEALTH.

Monopoly of Power by Privilege and Wealth—Obstruction to Social Reforms—Constitution of the British Parliament—"Vested Interests" in the House of Lords—"Vested Interests" in the House of Commons—Interests of Labour consequently Obstructed—Opposition to payment of Members—Just Distribution of Political Power dependent upon a more Equitable Distribution of the Products of Labour—Evil results of existing Distribution of Political Power—"After Sedan"—Inhumanity of War—Impoverishment caused by War—Cost of War to Tax-payers—Formation of European Labour Party check upon War—Effects of just Distribution of Political Power—British Rule over Dependent Nations—British Officialism in Ireland and India—Testimony of Sir James Caird—A Model Magistrate—Immediate Practical Remedies.

THE social reforms outlined in the preceding lectures have for their object the steady and permanent improvement of the condition of the people. I believe that the results of their embodiment in legislation would be a rapid rise of the general level of intelligence, and an almost equally rapid increase in the average of comfort, consequent upon the wider and more equitable distribution of wealth. There are few things more to be desired for any country than that its inhabitants shall be well fed, well clothed, and well educated; and if there be any considerable probability that the embodiment in legislation of the reforms specified in earlier lectures would have any such results for the people all earnest social reformers would do wisely to lend their energies to the cultivation of public opinion in the direction indicated.

But it must be clear that this greater extension of enlighten-

ment and wider distribution of wealth would be followed by great and important political consequences. I believe we should have, in the first place, a more real and just distribution of political power; and in the second place, a much more humane and wise exercise of that power. Can any one doubt the desirability of such a state of things?

Political power in these three kingdoms is now practically monopolised by the privileged and wealthy classes. And the consequence is, that almost if not quite all of the more important measures which have been introduced into Parliament in recent years have been confessedly not such as ought to pass, but such as could pass. The art of statesmanship is in a woful plight. It is a humiliating thing to hear a minister recommending the House of Commons or entreating the House of Lords to pass a particular Bill on the ground not of the good it will effect, but of the trifling injury it will inflict upon vested interests. To hear a minister saying of a so-called "great reform" Bill, that it is the least he can do, and adjuring privilege and wealth to permit it to pass on that account; and to hear the same minister in his next breath saying of the same measure, but to a different audience, the common people, that it is the most he can hope to do, and adjuring the common people to accept it on that score, is a melancholy testimony to the power of the few and the impotence of the many. It would be an interesting thing to know how many Bills involving social reform, to say nothing of political reform, have been introduced into Parliament during the last ten years, but never to reach a third reading; and then it would be yet more interesting to have an analysis of the voting or abstinence from voting in respect of such measures. The extension of the franchise during the last forty years has not been attended by any such marked increase in the power of the labouring classes as we were led to expect; and hence it is that social reforms having any reality in them are retarded by those whose success in life leads them to believe

that this is the best of all possible worlds, and that accordingly there is no necessity for any change of system. A "self-made man" says, "Look at me, go thou and do likewise," and thinks he has settled the social question. He assumes that everybody else has an equal chance with himself, and then rates those who fail, and holds up those who succeed, himself included, to the admiration of the world. How, indeed, should such men look upon the efforts of social reformers otherwise than as the exploits of lunatics altogether beneath the notice of sensible men of business?

For consider the constitution of the British Parliament. There is, to begin with, the House of Peers, concerning which it is not necessary to say anything further than that it probably contains more bigots, ignoramuses, profligates, and good-for-naughts than any similar assembly in the civilised world. These poor peers have been reared in the amazing delusion that they are the salt of the earth; and conscious as many of them must be of how savourless they are, what can we expect them to think of the miserable creatures who in relation to them are merely the earth? But what is the use of talking about this utterly worthless, meaningless anachronism? May one not as well expect to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear as hope to obtain the co-operation of this assembly in the enactment of any real reform? Indeed, take it altogether, is it possible for the human mind to conceive a more thoroughly and exhaustively stupid institution?

Its stupidity as an institution, however, does not mean that all its members are stupid. Many of the peers, indeed, are men of exceptional gifts and splendid attainments. Man for man, perhaps, of those who take active part in the business of government the peers have not the worst of it. Unhappily, these men, who are better than the institution, are its bulwark. And they are astute enough to know that there is scarcely any institution, short of the Crown, which is more secure than the

House of Lords. It is in the presence of these exceptional men, therefore, that the obstructive power of the House of Peers chiefly consists. Next, there is the fact that nearly 200 peers are directly interested in the Army and Navy; while nearly if not quite all the peers are indirectly interested in these services. Then it seems that sixty peers are associated with as many as 114 railways, as chairmen or directors, while many more are deeply interested not only as chairmen and directors, but as shareholders, in many hundreds of great commercial enterprises.

Let us turn now to the House of Commons. Its members have been carefully analysed with regard to their various "interests."¹ It appears that 168 members are directly interested in the Army and Navy; 282 represent land; 122 represent law; 18, liquor; 25, banks; 84, literature and science; 113, railways, including 21 chairmen, 6 deputy chairmen, 85 directors, and one contractor; 155 members represent commerce, *and two represent labour!* If we but think for a moment what all this means, we shall have no ground for surprise that the art of British statesmanship is the art of making a little reform go a long way. Privilege and wealth, naturally on the side of things as they are, enjoy a practical monopoly of political power. The peers have a branch of the legislature entirely to themselves, and wealth has another branch entirely to itself; and between the two the smothering or the obstruction of real reforms is a very simple business. So long as the people assent to the continuance of privilege to the peers, and so long as the existing unequal distribution of wealth obtains, so long must labour of brain or hand expect to occupy its present subordinate position. For what privilege fails to do wealth suffices to accomplish in the way of keeping labour in "its place." None but a rich man can enter the House of Commons as a general rule; and the House of Lords is recruited from the ranks of the rich, the stupid, and the cranky who get into the House of

¹ *Financial Reform Almanack.*

Commons. That House as at present constituted is not likely to make it easier than it now is for any but the exceptionally wealthy to pass its portals, and any proposals to make the official expenses of parliamentary candidates a charge upon the rates, and to pay an annual salary to all members of Parliament, have so far been met with the most insidious and determined opposition. For wealth controls the fourth estate—the press—to an enormous extent even yet, and the press is almost unanimous in declaring that the payment of members would lower the tone of the House of Commons. I repeat that extensions of the franchise have so far added little or nothing to the political power of labour. The Reform Bill of 1832 checked the power of mere privilege and increased the power of mere wealth. Subsequent extensions have done no more. The facts above enumerated with regard to the various “interests” of the members of both Houses sufficiently attest the truth of this statement. And so it will continue to be until—as a natural result of the growth of popular enlightenment, and of the wider diffusion of wealth, consequent upon the abolition of land monopoly and the steady and progressive application of the co-operative principle to industry—labour exercises directly that power which it now blindly delegates to its employers.

But the growth of popular enlightenment and the more equitable distribution of wealth would not only result in a more real and just distribution of political power. There would follow of necessity a more humane and wise exercise of that power. Can any one doubt that such a thing is most sorely needed? To me it appears that unjust wars and unjust political rule are a necessary consequence of the practical monopoly of political power by mere privilege and wealth, and that both these evils would be reduced to a minimum, if not wholly abolished, if that monopoly were destroyed.

War! glorious war! Here is a picture of a famous field of battle.

"Let your readers fancy masses of coloured rags glued together with blood and brains, and pinned into strange shapes by fragments of bones. Let them conceive men's bodies without heads, legs without bodies, heaps of human entrails attached to red and blue cloth, and disembowelled corpses in uniform, bodies lying about in all attitudes with skulls shattered, faces blown off, hips smashed, bones, flesh, and gay clothing all pounded together as if brazed in a mortar extending for miles, not very thick in one place, but recurring perpetually for weary hours; and then they cannot, with the most vivid imagination, come up to the sickening reality of that butchery. No nightmare could be so frightful."¹

This is one side of the picture. But there is yet another. About the middle of the Franco-German War, "there were in the province of Westphalia 11,817 married women, the wives and widows of soldiers, together with 22,713 children obtaining relief from the public funds. In Hanover 9624 women and 26,418 children were dependent upon the public for support. In the Rhenish provinces there were 14,312 married women, and 29,619 fatherless children who were utterly destitute." Of course, this is only a fragment even of this side of the picture. A reliable estimate gives two millions as the number of men slain by war in the eighteen years between 1853 and 1871. What suffering that means to women and children it is impossible to realise. Another side of the picture is the cost of war. But here, again, though we use figures, they represent facts which cannot be at all adequately realised. It is estimated that the Crimean War cost £340,000,000; the American War, £1,841,000,000, or about five times the estimated cost of liberating the slaves by purchase; the Franco-German War cost France £400,000,000. As to Great Britain and Ireland it is authoritatively stated that in the fifteen years previous to 1871 £434,000,000 was spent on the army and navy services, and

¹ Dr. Russell in the *Times* on the battle of Sedan.

during the ten years between 1870 and 1880 the amount rose to £500,000,000. These figures, I say, are too large for realisation; it is only when we reduce the statement to terms such as this, that four out of every five shillings of taxation are spent on "the services," that we are at all able to comprehend the cost of war.

And yet when we ask for a justification of any of the wars of modern times we ask in vain. The real reason why Europe has poured out so much blood and treasure on war, is simply because, in every country on that continent, political power is monopolised by mere privilege and wealth, and incidents which aristocratic and wealthy people would never dream of converting into causes of war if they had to do the fighting themselves or pay the cost, are magnified into insults to the British flag or the German flag or some other nation's bunting, which can only be referred to the arbitrament of war. As matters now stand, so far as Great Britain and Ireland are concerned, with the fighting interests firmly settled in high places, their ramifications extending through both Houses of Parliament as well as the press; and with wealth and "British interests" synonymous terms, we can look for little change in the exercise of political power. But with the acquisition of real power by an enlightened and an independent industrial democracy, we may safely look for a very startling and beneficent change. The peoples of the different nations of Europe, and also of America, have no interest in war. Their highest interests are all summed up in the Divine words, "On earth peace and good will among men." In their present disorganised and subordinate condition, however, the peoples of Europe are no match for their rulers. And there is only one way by which the inhuman exercise of political power, which characterises the ruling classes in all nations, can be at all adequately checked. Diplomacy may do much, arbitration may do more, the establishment of a great international tribunal might do more still; but until the people have

real power, all such things will be lacking in the one element of importance—reality. I venture to think that there is more reason to expect an effective check upon war to come from an international federation of labour interests than from any other quarter. If in Great Britain, where the formation of a Labour party ought to be possible, the enterprise were at once entered upon, the workers of other nations of Europe would follow suit to the best of their limited opportunities; and there can be no doubt that a European Labour party would be an uncomfortable factor in European politics, so far as the interests of the privileged and wealthy classes are concerned, while so far as the moral and material interests of the peoples are concerned, there can be equally no doubt that the influence of such a party would be in the highest sense beneficent. Though it might be inconsiderable in point of numbers, and insignificant for a time in point of wealth, its potency would be wonderful so long as it preserved solidarity. A Labour party in all the countries of Europe would meet with many difficulties it is true; but if it could withstand the seductive influence of privilege and wealth, if its leaders could shake hands with lords and millionnaires without having their principles shaken out of them, all the rest would be easy. Such a party would be of necessity the determined enemy of the fighting interests and their allies; and by acting in concert could virtually, in almost every case, compel the reference of international disputes to arbitration. Such a party would, at all events, be in a position to demand, and would require, a much more definite reason why human beings should slay each other than is usually felt to be necessary by the well-to-do people who never have to fight. If real political power lay with the people, the people would refuse to act like savages for the delectation of their ornamental rulers.

In another matter, closely akin to the preceding, I venture to think, if the people of these three kingdoms enjoyed real power, they would exercise it more wisely than do those who

now monopolise it. I refer to the character of British rule over dependent nations. The aristocracy of these kingdoms have been trained to regard themselves as the favourites of heaven. It is no wise surprising, therefore, that those who at home have been accustomed to regard the common people as dirt beneath their feet, should manifest a yet more supreme contempt for those nationalities whom the English people have conquered or subdued, and whose government has been committed to their hands. It is very unfortunate for English rule that it should have had such unhappy representatives ; but under the circumstances it is not surprising that among the nations subject to their rule the English people should be regarded as a nation of bullies ; an opinion which the subject nations may be pardoned for entertaining, seeing that, according to Mr. Gladstone, the people of England “ had the reputation in Europe—he was afraid not altogether unjustly—of being rather an arrogant people.”¹ The English people have many excellent qualities, but they are certainly not exempt from the inability to rule other people, which is an infirmity common to all the nations of the earth. How, indeed, should meddling with other people’s business be more successful amongst nations than amongst individuals ? Community of interest may serve as a basis for voluntary association ; but when the interest is all on one side, voluntary association is impossible, and meddling is only mischievous. And when the meddling is committed to the hands of heaven’s favourites—the British aristocracy—the force of folly can no further go. The scions of birth make bad enough officials, yet the scions of wealth out-Herod them, and between the two English rule becomes a thing of such pitiful character that the English people would be heartily ashamed of it if they only knew what its real features were.* But officialism born of privilege and wealth is supremely cunning ; and aided by its parents, is able to gull the English people with an ease which is amusing to

¹ Speech at Whitby, Sept. 3, 1871.

itself, but supremely exasperating to those who have to endure its insolence. So omnipotent are the forces such officialism has at its command, that it is able to treat with the utmost indifference any glimpses of truth as to its real character which may find their way into print. During the recent agitation in Ireland several Englishmen of eminence, notably Mr. John Morley, Prof. Leone Levi, Mr. Boyd Kinnear, Mr. Samuel Storey, and Mr. J. L. Joynes, visited that country, and looking on, satisfied themselves that the Land League agitation had righteous aims. Some of these gentlemen published their views of the real state of the case, but we have had no reason to suppose that Irish officialism has suffered to any extent. Indeed, to cure its effects, we have had actually a more stringent dose of it.¹

But if the real character of English officialism in Ireland is so readily concealed from the English people, what can be expected with regard to the same thing in India? The common belief with reference to India is that British rule is regarded with the most passionate adoration by the people of that country. It is altogether impossible to imagine a more complete delusion. Any student of revolutionary symptoms knows perfectly well that the overthrow of British rule in India is only a question of time. It is delayed pending the organisation of a concerted movement. The supreme difficulty of such a movement consists in the variety of races inhabiting the country, and in the condition of comparative beggary to which the people have been reduced. Nevertheless India is seething with discontent. The officials despise the people, and the people know it, and resent it as they ought to do. The officials minimise concessions, and delay them until they are devoid of any virtue. And if the

¹ Existing officials, sitting on a volcano, complacently assure England that law and order once more reign, and England is deluded into believing that the comparative quietude of Ireland is due to the benevolent despotism of Earl Spencer and Mr. Trevelyan. It is a simple matter of fact that these gentlemen and their malodorous underlings are no more responsible for the absence of agitation than the man in the moon. The responsibility rests on quite other shoulders.

native press complains or bluntly criticises it is threatened with suppression; while every care is taken that its complaints and criticisms shall either not reach England at all, or shall be tortured into crimes. Evidence of the truth of all this is abundant, but I shall content myself with adducing the testimony of Sir James Caird, who was a member of the Famine Commission appointed by the Marquis of Salisbury, and during his travels through the country made use of his eyes and ears, and subsequently published a good deal of what he saw and heard in the *Nineteenth Century*. In the grand gateway at Secundra, Sir James says, "the gaols at present are overflowing with prisoners for thefts in consequence of the famine and high price of food." This was one of the famine districts, but "so silent are these people in their distress that the settlement officer, who had been here two months encamped on the land, had not observed any particular poverty, nor had become aware either that the people were in a state of famine, or were dying of it. And to my astonishment the Government representative learnt all this for the first time as the result of our visit." Sir James would not have been astonished if he had been an Irishman! But here is another beautiful fact. "At another place I visited the courts of law. In one the assistant magistrate was dispensing justice. Twelve persons had been tied up in a row on the previous day and whipped with thirty stripes for theft. *The magistrate said to me with some satisfaction that he had at last got a policeman who could break the skin at the third stroke!*" Sir James naïvely adds that this was the only instance of such a feeling he met with; but it is an obvious remark that he would not have met with this if the magistrate in question had had any idea that his amiable remark would have found its way into print; and, besides, it is not every village tyrant who will acknowledge to a man like Sir James Caird his peculiar gratifications. I have not heard that this particular brute has been cashiered. Sir James had abundant

evidence of the character of English officials in other respects. He says: "If you ask the European officers the condition of the people in any village or district, they can seldom tell without making a special inquiry!" And here is a general remark of some significance: "India seems to suffer much from secretaries, men of ability and clever with the pen, some of whom for these convenient qualities rise to high positions without the opportunity of gaining experience out of doors, or any accurate knowledge of the people;" and "as there is neither parliament nor public opinion to criticise or control" the secretaries, "and as their influence in questions of promotion is great, they possess a power, not only quite beyond that of official persons in the same position at home, but greater than that of our parliamentary heads of departments. The interference which they exercise is very properly creating a strong desire for independence and self-government by each Presidency, and cannot be too soon placed under some effectual control." Other difficulties there are looming in the near future. A legal gentleman, a pleader in the Courts of Lucknow and Calcutta, called on Sir James, and gave it as his opinion that the higher education now being given to the people of lower caste will in fifty years make it impossible for England to hold the country, and the legal gentleman regarded that evidently as a calamity. Officialism comes in for the most emphatic condemnation at the hands of Sir James, as, for instance, "The tendency of officialism is to bring every person into subjection to the rule of the leading officials in the capital;" and again, "Here, as in other parts of India, officialism is said not to favour the introduction of European capital;" yet again, "Disaffection is aroused; we are hated by the Mussulmans and disliked by the Hindoos. This is not likely at present to take tangible form, as there is no head under whom the various dissatisfied persons could unite. But a crusade is being preached here (Baroda) against the infidel government by the Mahommedans, and on all sides there is a readiness to

blame it on every occasion. There was lately a tumult at Surat, during which the civil authorities had to take shelter in a public building from the violence of the people, and which might have led to direful results but for the sharp interposition of the troops. It is singularly illustrative of our rule, that though the people for six generations have known no other, we are still strangers among them. Our representatives come and go, now faster than ever, and we and they look on each other with distrust."

Now I have hope that by the testimony of Sir James Caird with regard to India, and by subsequent testimony of my own with regard to Ireland, I shall at least succeed in convincing the people of England that their rule is and must be evil so long as political power is monopolised by privilege and wealth. And I have faith that when that monopoly is destroyed, and political power is more justly distributed, it will be more wisely exercised. It will not be directed to maintaining "the balance of power" by inhuman ways, nor will it be employed to stifle the legitimate aspirations of other peoples.

And now ere passing on, I will answer a question which has frequently presented itself. Can anything of a practical character be immediately done to check the baneful monopoly of political power exercised by mere privilege and wealth? In my judgment a very great deal can be done, and done at once. Labour organisations have only to effect a slight change of tactics. Instead of waiting on political parties, they have only to permit political parties to wait on them. If they would do this, as they might very easily, we should witness remarkable changes. We should have to listen to many admonitions from our "real friends," as they call themselves—the privileged and wealthy classes. But if Labour would adopt as its motto, "He has most friends who has least need of them;" and would organise itself as a distinct party in the State, it might work wonders in a very few years. "Bossed" as the press is for the

most part, yet it is not so completely bossed as are the constituencies, and there is hardly any enterprise in which labour might more readily and withal more usefully engage co-operatively than in running a powerful press. By this means the constituencies might be educated up to the level of combination to return a Labour party fifty or sixty strong to the House of Commons, instructed to act independently of political parties, and with a view to the interests of labour. Thus an excellent beginning would be made. Then the House of Lords would go—and it will not go until then—for Wealth to propitiate Labour would make a holocaust of Privilege.

Mr. Trevelyan, speaking at Glasgow, on the 6th of September, 1884, upon the subject of the Franchise Bill, combats the theory that the Bill would destroy the agricultural interest in the House of Commons. He argued thus with reference to the labourer: "For the first time, if this Bill is passed, his voice will be heard, his wishes will be known through the mouth of his representatives, instead of by a petition, which the member who presents it hardly takes the trouble to read." But Mr. Trevelyan is careful to show that the labourer need have no hope of being represented by any of his own class, for he goes on to say: "Nobody pretends that the manufacturing interest is swamped because the operatives of such places as Glasgow, Paisley, and Dundee, have votes. Why should the agricultural interest be anything but strengthened by the votes of the agricultural labourers of Northumberland and Berwickshire? . . . Has the power of employers of labour in towns been destroyed or diminished by the extension of the Borough Franchise? Let any one take a list of the principal manufacturing centres in England and Scotland, and check off their parliamentary members, and I will venture to say that he will find that *three-fourths of them are employers of labour*. And if this Bill passes, the tenant farmers who are *the employers of labour* in the rural districts, will have a chance of getting into parliament, and making *their power* felt there." Mr. Trevelyan could hardly have let the cat out of the bag more neatly. Further

testimony in support of what has been here advanced is to be found in the remarkable and interesting Report of the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress, presented to that body at its sitting at Aberdeen, also on the 6th of September. The Report notices that the Employers' Liability Act is defective—a circumstance which will occasion no surprise to thoughtful readers of Mr. Trevelyan's remarks—and adds, "We have increasing evidence of the necessity of preventing employers contracting out of the Act of 1880, and hope that at no distant period we may be able to do so." Further on the Report alludes to the Merchant Shipping Bill in the following pregnant terms: "While some of the clauses could undoubtedly have been improved from the workman's point of view, the Bill on the whole was one of the most effective and courageous attempts to deal with a great scandal ever introduced by a Cabinet Minister. But *the combination of shipping interests, like an avalanche, crushed this humane attempt to protect the victims of rapacity.* The sacrifice of human life on the altar of personal interest and greed is still going on, and will, we fear, continue until the people make a mighty effort to support the protection of our sailors, and declare in a voice that cannot be disregarded, that men and fathers of families are more precious than profits." Further, the Report describes Mr. Chamberlain's proposed Railway Regulation Bill, as one which would have been most valuable to railway employes, but *the determined opposition of the railway interest*, it appears, has compelled its withdrawal. The Report also alludes in terms of condemnation to the "*interested opposition of the banking interest* in the House of Commons to the Savings' Bank Act Amendment Bill." Perhaps, however, the most interesting portion of the entire Report is that which refers to the Paris Conference of last year, on International Trades Unionism, as to which the conclusion of the Parliamentary Committee is "that a compact labour party, working steadily for itself, may not be out of place in this country."

PART III.

POLITICAL CRIME:

HOW IRELAND IS RULED AND RUINED.

POLITICAL JUSTICE:

HOW THE ANGLO-IRISH PROBLEM MIGHT BE SOLVED.

or the threat of warders' reports, can realise what that heaven-born word implies !

I was liberated once—unexpectedly set free, after seven and a half years of close imprisonment, and I am almost inclined to say, that the punishment involved in a penal servitude of that duration would be worth enduring again to enjoy the wild, ecstatic, soul-filling happiness of the first day of freedom. It is a sensation of delight akin to that which Adam must have experienced upon waking to life and consciousness in the Garden of Eden ; only Adam's memory could recall neither pain nor sorrow as a contrast to the living pleasure of Paradise ; while everything which meets the gaze of the liberated prisoner, every thought of the present and the future assumes a brighter hue and wears a more blissful meaning from the terrible recollection of the felon degradation, the narrow cell, the stinted sunlight, the loathsome daily task, the brutal warder, and the weary, heart-longing expectancy for the hour of deliverance.

This reminiscence of a kindred joy to that which you are shortly to experience, reminds me that, while I have described for you the various classes of criminals that are to be found within this prison of Portland, I have omitted to enlighten you upon one type with which you have been the most familiar—myself. Yes, I am “a criminal.” The law has branded me as such ; and the instruments with whom rest the carrying out of the law's decree have made me feel that they, at least, believe that penal servitude was a richly merited punishment, whatever my own opinion to the contrary may have been.

“And pray what crime have *you* been guilty of?”

I must detain you for a few hours more, in order to answer your question. Your curiosity must be my warrant for postponing the hour of your release.

I am a native of Ireland, a country rich in almost everything which makes a nation great—a fertile soil, an industrious and a virtuous people ; but lacking this one thing, which you and I

also lack—Liberty. My country is ruled by another—by England. And that rule is maintained by a garrison of anti-Irish landlords and a horde of unsympathetic officials. Let me endeavour to convey to you some idea of the nature of this rule, in order that I may indicate the nature and the justification of my “crime,” which is none other than that I have attempted to assert my country’s right to rule herself.

If an “intelligent foreigner” were asked the question, “What was the government of Ireland?” he would most probably answer, “The same as that of England,” or else confess his ignorance on the subject. An Englishman, who would have neither resided in Ireland nor cared to acquire correct information on how the country is ruled, would, of course, reply, “It has the same constitution as that of England, with a Viceroy to represent the Queen.” While an Irishman’s answer to the same question would simply be, “Dublin Castle.”

The singularity of this last definition of Irish government consists in its absolute truth, and the fact that ninety-nine out of every one hundred Englishmen are as ignorant of what “The Castle” really means, in the rule of Ireland, as if it were situated at the mouth of the Yang-tse-Kiang, and was identified with the government of the Celestial Empire, instead of standing by the banks of the Liffey, the representative of England’s power and authority in the rule of the “Sister Island.”

Without caring to inquire into the cause of this unfortunate ignorance on the part of the English people, I will endeavour to do my best to remove such of it as may give way to the convincing force of facts. I hope to succeed in presenting this “Castle” system in its true light to the public of Great Britain. Should I do so, its real character of practical absolutism and anti-Irish feeling will stand revealed before all right-thinking men, as at once the primary, if not the greatest factor in the discontent of the Irish people, and a centralised despotism without a parallel in any European state outside of Russia.

In order that Englishmen may better understand the true working of this headquarters of English rule in Ireland, and learn something of the chief cause of our disaffection to that rule, I will try and describe what a similar government would be in England, supposing the relative positions of the two countries were reversed, and the manner of conducting their respective civil and military affairs exchanged.

The Home Office would be "The Castle." All its subordinate officials would either be Irishmen, or Englishmen holding anti-English principles and sentiments. Not only would there be no popular Englishman occupying any post of trust in the administration of his country's government, but the approach of any such to the very building which would represent such government, would be looked upon by the military police in charge of the same as a menace to the authority of "London Castle."

The Queen and the Viceroy would, of course, change residences, and Buckingham Palace would become the "Vice-regal Lodge" of St. James's Park. The Irish nobleman who would be the nominal head of the English Government would also have to be a Roman Catholic, as a law would have been passed in an Irish parliament, sitting in Dublin, declaring that the religion of the majority of the people of England should not be that of the man appointed to rule them. The Irish Lord Lieutenant of England would be in the hands of an Irish or pro-Irish "London Castle" Ring. He would be taught that the dignity of "Her Majesty's Lord Lieutenant-General and Governor-General of England" would be best consulted by attending, almost exclusively, to the holding of petty levees, or Brummagem Courts, in "London Castle;" a building that would stand protected by a military barracks on the one side, and by various police departments and detective officers on the other, as proof that the depôt of Irish government in London was (poetically) situated in the hearts of its people, and resting for foundation upon the public sentiment of the land.

The people who would receive cards of invitation to these "Castle" Courts would all be selected by the Ring aforesaid, as neither the Irish Lord-Lieutenant nor his Irish Chief Secretary would know anything of the politics of London Society. These invitations would be confined to the Irish, Scotch, and English officers whose regiments might be quartered in and near London at the time, for the protection of "The Castle;" and such few Anglo-Irish Members of Parliament as might have obtained their seats in the Dublin Parliament through the influence of the Ring, and who would be distinguished for their defence of the same in the Irish House of Commons against the searching attacks of popular English members. The remainder of the favoured would be made up of judges, crown prosecutors, government officials, "castle hacks," office-seeking lawyers, landlords, a few anti-English members of the London Corporation, and such fortunate grocers, drapers, pawnbrokers, and hotel-keepers as might have caught the eye of the Ring in the pursuit of their respective callings, and who would be known as thoroughly loyal to Ireland's rule of England, and opposed to all national sentiment and aspirations on the part of the English masses. When the nobility and gentry of England (all, or nearly all, of Irish descent) should condescend to attend one of these "Castle" levees, the fashionably-dressed consort of an East End tradesman, who would be fortunate enough to receive a card of invitation, would have to occupy the eighty-second place in "the roll of ladies' precedence," as established by an English Sir Bernard Burke; and from thence contemplate, with feminine pride and generosity of sex, her eighty-first degree more favoured sister in Viceregal notice.

All popular English public men would be rigorously excluded from the "London Castle" Court. Mr. Gladstone (who would probably be an English Gracchus), Messrs. Bright, Chamberlain, Dilke, Labouchere, Morley, Trevelyan, Forster, Sir W. Lawson, and others, would all be "ex-suspects," and be held as dangerous

enemies to the peace and welfare of England. Mr. Joseph Cowen would be an ex-political convict. All these would be debarred from Viceregal society or "London Castle" honours. If the Lord Mayor of London should chance to be a popular favourite, the Castle Ring would succeed in making the Lord-Lieutenant select some public occasion upon which to offer the chief magistrate of the metropolis of England a public insult, by refusing to dine with himself and the city fathers.

The remaining duties of the Irish Viceroy of England would mainly consist in delivering an annual speech upon an exclusively viceregal topic—the growing prosperity of England under Irish rule; especially since his party came into office and himself into England as its ruler. It would be his duty to show, by a formidable array of figures,—specially prepared by the chief statistician of the Ring,—that notwithstanding bad harvests, depression of trade, increase of pauperism, and continued political agitation by misguided men (like Messrs. Gladstone, Bright, Chamberlain, Forster, and Cowen), the prosperity of England was advancing in a most marked manner. By the amount of deposits (from landlords, graziers, and civil servants) in the banks, it would follow that the average savings of the English people were on the increase. True, thousands of English farm labourers and artisans might be leaving the country; but then the number of cows and horses were multiplying, while pigs were being more economically fattened than twenty years ago; and emigration was after all a humane Irish policy for the congested population of England. Finally, all that England would want, in viceregal estimation, would be rest from political agitation, and a rigorous application of law to all disturbers of order and assailants of the sacred rights of landlord property.

If, after the performance of such onerous duties as these, the Irish representative of royalty in England aspired to make himself appear popular to the public opinion of London, he

would visit a Ragged School or two in the East End, and express himself delighted with the management of such institutions. On the anniversary of England's patron saint he might chose to wear a rose in his button-hole, while an Irish military band would be playing "Rule Britannia," and from the top of the boundary wall of "London Castle" show himself and his generosity to the few hundred people and corner boys whom the music would attract by scattering a few pounds' worth of small silver among the audience. If, during the remainder of the year, he had an eye to augmenting his salary of £20,000, he might follow the example of a recent Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland by grazing the cows of the viceregal establishment in St. James's Park, and sell the surplus butter-milk to one of the London workhouses.

The training of the Irish Chief Secretary to the Irish Lord-Lieutenant of England would be the most difficult task which the "London Castle" Ring would have to perform in order to keep the government of England practically out of his, and centre it in their own hands. He would be the virtual governor of the country; but being an Irishman, and member for an Irish constituency, he would be almost entirely ignorant of English affairs, and totally unacquainted with the topography of England. Consequently, he would have to depend upon the permanent "Castle" staff for all information necessary to carry on the business of government, and to answer questions in the Irish House of Commons touching public occurrences in England, character of officials, &c., &c. As Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant, he would have to be absent in Dublin during six months in each year to attend to the parliamentary duties of his office. Actually during this period, and virtually at all times, the government of England would remain in the hands of the "London Castle" Ring, which would be made up as follows from the salaried heads of the various departments of the Castle system :

The permanent Under-Secretary of the Castle.

The assistant Under-Secretary.

The Law Adviser to the Castle.

The Crown and Treasury Solicitor to the Castle.

The Crown Solicitor for the County and City of London.

The Head Inspector of the Royal English Constabulary.

The Commander-in-Chief of the Irish Forces in England.

The Vice-President and three Members of the Local Government Board.

The Chairman of the Board of Works and two Commissioners.

The Resident Commissioner of "National" Education.

The active members of a body known as the Privy Council of England, twenty of whom would be the judges of the land.

The enormous power that would be wielded by this Ring, and the anti-English character of its *personnel*, will readily be understood from the following brief summary of its administrative functions and analysis of its composition.

"The Under-Secretary of London Castle" would not be affected by any change of party government. His temporary nominal superiors might be Whig or Tory, but this would make no practical difference to the permanent officer^{ag} who would have the key of the whole administrative machine of England constantly in his hand. Under a weak Lord-Lieutenant he would be the real governor of the country. The rule of a strong viceroy would but change the mode, not the reality, of his influence; for without his constant advice, and the assistance of the knowledge of persons and things which the permanent Under-Secretary would alone possess, no Irish nobleman or commoner could play the part of Lord-Lieutenant or Chief Secretary of England.

The man in whose hands this enormous power would thus be placed would be the very negation of an Englishman. Alien in blood, in religion, in national feeling, he would scarcely have

one sentiment in common with the people whose liberties would be at his disposal. He would be all but absolutely independent of English public opinion, owing his appointment to the exigencies of that policy which would find it necessary to exclude from every post of administrative government all men who might be expected of sharing the national feelings of the English people. The same rule which influenced the selection of himself would guide him in the disposal of the patronage which the office of Under-Secretary would place in his hands. All his subordinates would have to be pro-Irish in sentiment, anti-English in prejudice, and mostly ultramontane Catholic in religion. The singing of "Rule Britannia," or "Britons never shall be slaves," would cause the instant dismissal of any English subordinate official of the Castle who should thus manifest his disloyalty to Irish Rule. (Such songs would be considered treasonable, and a member of the Royal English Constabulary would be only doing his duty to "London Castle" by arresting any person whom he should hear whistling such tunes "with the intent of intimidating her Majesty's English subjects.")¹

"The Assistant Under-Secretary"² would be an Englishman of ultra loyalty towards Irish rule. As clerk of the Privy Council, he would hold a very important position in the inner circle of the "Castle" Ring. His advice would be sought in the issuing of proclamations. Matters of private or public interest which the Castle system would require to be brought before the Council would have to pass through his hands. In times of cattle disease the power of restricting the sale of stock in certain markets, of exporting or importing beasts, etc., would

¹ During the Land League excitement in Ireland, a little boy, aged 10, was prosecuted for "intimidating her Majesty's subjects" by whistling "Harvey Duff" in the streets of a provincial town.

² Another assistant Under-Secretary has been added to the Castle government of Ireland since 1882. A new department, that of police and crime, was created after the passage of the Coercion Act of the same year, and the new post has been filled by an Anglo-Indian.

lie, to a great extent, with this official. In religion he would be a Catholic.

"The Law Adviser to the Castle" would fill one of the positions most peculiar to that system of rule, and a post the like of which is not to be found in connection with any other civilised government. He might be termed the consulting lawyer of the Under-Secretary and director-in-chief of all preliminary proceedings leading up to State prosecutions. His duties would be manifold. He would have to advise the magistrates throughout England how to carry out the wishes of the "Castle" towards prisoners who might have infringed upon Castle law and order, whether bail should or should not be accepted, and whether or not a person who committed a crime, say in Rutlandshire, was more likely to be convicted by a jury of that county than by one in Northumberland. His functions would quite easily dispose of that trouble to centralised government which is found in the legal fiction that the prerogative of magistrates is to judge impartially between the subject and the State.

To prevent the pernicious influence which such a fiction might exercise upon the minds of the disloyal English masses, the post of Law Adviser to "London Castle" would be filled by a true and tried Castle hack, who should hate his own country's aspiration to be free from Irish rule, and who would look upon the religion of the Protestant people of England as constituting a badge of inferiority, and rendering most of those professing it neither fit nor proper persons to constitute a jury in any case in which the Crown should be prosecutor.¹

¹ "We have recently come upon a document which is in many respects the most instructive piece of official reading it has ever been our good fortune to enjoy. Its title is 'Rules for Crown Solicitors and Sessional Crown Solicitors,' and its compilation is ascribed to a distinguished judge while Attorney-General for Ireland. The rules have been the *vade mecum* these years back for Mr. George Bolton and his *confrères* in Crown prosecutions, and some of the puzzling practices in the packing of juries, which are associated with various names among those officials, lose all their

"The Crown and Treasury Solicitor to London Castle" would be an important member of the "Castle" Ring, and would be of the same anti-English feeling as the preceding members.

"The Crown Solicitor for the City and County of London" would be a highly useful and efficient "Castle" lawyer. His would be the duty of arranging the challenges for the Crown side in all political and criminal prosecutions. He would be the author of a manuscript history of the antecedents of every popular English public man who would be suspected by the Ring of holding views inimical to Irish rule in England. The work would be for the private reading of members of the

mystery in the light of these marvellous directions. It will be learned with unfeigned astonishment, that an entire class of business men in Ireland are described in the rules as unfit to exercise the functions of jurors in certain cases. Mere Catholics and Nationalists have long been under the ban in political cases, but the Licensed Vintners' Association has been miserably at fault in not discovering before now that its members are deemed by the Crown to be ignorant of the obligations of a juror's oath, or, what amounts to the same thing, are not to be relied upon to give an honest and impartial verdict. This fact is revealed in Rule 9 of the Crown Prosecutor's Manual. The rule is long in detail, but under it the amplest hints are communicated to the Crown Solicitor as to how his prisoner may be involved in the meshes of an inextricable net, and then it proceeds as follows:—"In all cases of *peculiar local excitement* in any particular town or district"—instance the trial of Myles Joyce, or of Cornwall and Kirwan—"it will be prudent, if the panel permit, to set aside all persons returned from such locality, and in all cases every vintner, publican, and retailer of spirits or malt liquors shall, *as a matter of course*, be ordered to stand by.' . . . By another provision of the same Rule 9, . . . the Crown prosecutor may set aside *all persons* whose motives they suspect, 'although same may not amount to a legal ground of challenge, and may not admit of legal proof.' This is an honest bit of brutal candour, but it is, in so many words, the principle which has governed the system of trial by jury in Ireland as far back as the memory goes. . . . Where the system is watered down to accommodate the religious and political prejudices of Crown Prosecutors, it is little wonder if, with 'the pulse of the Constitution dead at the extremities,' the Constitution should be sometimes regarded with unmingled contempt. Our experience shows us that in one description of criminal cases a *soupcçon* of nationality is an unpardonable disqualification in a juror; in another wide class of cases Catholics, because they are Catholics, must stand aside, and the 'Rules for Crown Solicitors' now inform us that 'in all cases of local excitement' the licensed vintner is 'as a matter of course' a person utterly unfit to act as a juror" (*The Freeman's Journal*. Dublin, August 26, 1884).

"Castle" Ring. He would profess to hold in his hands the threads of all conspiracies against the "Castle" system. The disposition of a large share of the secret service money would therefore be in connection with his office. Like his other colleagues of the Ring, he would be Catholic and anti-English in faith and feeling.

"The Inspector-General of Constabulary" would also be an Irishman and a Catholic. As head of 12,000 military police, which would be scattered over every parish of England, he would be next in importance to the Under-Secretary in the councils of the Ring. His would really be the Irish army of occupation in England. To him would be allotted the duty of training the sons of English farmers to become the spies and pimps of their own country, the janizary force which could be most relied upon for the repression of any attempt on the part of their own countrymen to throw off the yoke of Ireland. Daily reports from every police barrack in England would be forwarded to the Inspector-General at "London Castle." If Joseph Cowen should address a public meeting in Newcastle-on-Tyne, a special report of his speech, with an account of the objects and conduct of the gathering, would be supplied by the police of Newcastle to the head of the force in the "Castle" of London. The same would be done towards Messrs. Chamberlain, Forster, Trevelyan, and other popular English public men, for the information of the Inspector-General and the Ring. Strangers arriving at country places would have their movements watched by the local constabulary, and particulars of their business would be ferretted out and transmitted, along with a description of their persons, to the "Castle." No public body, municipality, or local board could interfere with the police of the Inspector-General. Just as the Under-Secretary could influence the action of magistrates and justices of the peace through the Law Adviser of the "Castle," so could he control the entire police force of England through the Inspector-General

of English Constabulary. The prevailing notion, obtaining in most countries, about the police being the servants of the people would be thoroughly exploded under the system of an Irish Inspector-General of Royal English Constabulary. The English people would be taught that the "Castle" police were their masters. They could arrest Englishmen on suspicion; enter the houses of Englishmen on suspicion, at any time, day or night; keep a constant espionage upon suspected Englishmen; bludgeon Englishmen on the smallest provocation, and prosecute their victims for insolence and intimidation afterwards; they would allow no Englishman to carry arms except those who would be known to be of the Anglo-Irish garrison; while they would intimidate Englishmen by carrying rifles and side-arms themselves in the ordinary discharge of "police" duty.

"The Commander of the Forces" would be an Irish general, who would have distinguished himself in the military service of Ireland. He would be a Roman Catholic, and hold anti-English ideas on all matters affecting the government of the country. The 30,000 Irish soldiers which would be constantly under his command in England would render him one of the most formidable factors in the maintenance of Irish rule, and a man of weight in the deliberation of the "London Castle" Ring.

"The Vice-President and (three) members of the Local Government Board" would bring under the immediate influence of the Ring the whole Poor Law system of England. By this centralised control over the action of Boards of Guardians, enormous power would be wielded against popular ideas. All the accounts of these public bodies, as well as those of all the municipalities throughout England, would have to be submitted to the Local Government Board to be audited.¹ Small items of expenditure on account of municipal honours shown to popular public men—such as Gladstone, Chamberlain, Bright, and Forster—would

¹ In England, at present, local bodies audit their own accounts. In Ireland the practice is as illustrated above.

be disallowed, while any expense incurred in a similar way in connection with the Irish Lord-Lieutenant of England, or members of the Royal Family of Ireland, would be passed unquestioned.

The Poor Law system which "London Castle" rule of England would inflict upon that country, would be framed with the specific intention of giving whatever power could not be centralised in the Castle Board into the hands of the landlords of England, who would be Ireland's territorial garrison. This would be effected by a system of multiple voting, and the provision that an *ex-officio* guardian (from the landed interest) should be selected out of each Union district for each guardian elected by the rate-payers of the same district. This would insure, at least, as many "Castle" guardians as popular ones, on each Board throughout England; ¹ and such *ex-officios* would be the direct representatives of the Irish garrison of conquest, and the indirect agents of the "Castle" Local Government Board in thwarting the plans, ideas, and actions of the popular party on all these local bodies.

Another important function of the "Castle" Local Government Board would be the inquiry into and reporting upon all the chronic visitations of distress which would fall upon England as a consequence of English landlordism, absence of alternative industries to that of agriculture, and the general impoverishment which would result from centuries of Irish misgovernment, absenteeism, &c., &c. Such reports, as a matter of course, would be coloured by the "Castle" officials on the Board, who would be in thorough sympathy with the institutions and laws from the operation of which such periodical distress would spring. One member of this Board would be a Protestant; the other two would be Roman Catholics, as would also the Secretaries of

¹ In England, at the present time, two-thirds of the Poor Law Guardians are elected, leaving but one-third *ex-officio*. In Ireland the *ex-officios* have half the representation. The English system was once applied to Ireland, but it was repealed again in a few years.

the Board, and ten out of the twelve Inspectors who would be deputed, when occasion would arise, to hold inquiries in connection with the management of workhouses, suspicious deaths of paupers, &c., &c., in any Union in England.

"The Chairman and (two) Commissioners of Public Works," with secretary, architect, engineer, accountant, solicitor and superintendent of national monuments, would all be Roman Catholics. Not a single member of the Protestant faith, or man tainted with popular sympathies, would be found in connection with this the most important Board of the "London Castle" system of ruling England, saving, perhaps, a hall-porter or messenger. To give an idea of the influence which this Board would wield, and of the patronage that would be at its disposal, it is only necessary to indicate what its special functions would be under a "London Castle."¹ It would have control over all public works, piers, and harbours; it would control all famine relief works; arterial drainage; inland navigation works; and be in addition the Loan Board under the Irish Treasury for the whole of England.

"The Resident Commissioner of National Education" would be the only head of a Castle department who would be of the same religion as the majority of his English fellow-countrymen. He would be a Protestant; but of that type which would be known in England as a "Cawstle Protestant"—i. e. an unmitigated English flunkey, who would toady and pander to every Irish Lord-Lieutenant and Irish Chief Secretary, that would be sent from Dublin to perpetuate Irish rule over Englishmen. He would take care to supply the most antiquated set of school class-books to the "National" Schools of England that could be compiled by the most ardent anti-English educationist. They would be fifty years behind the progressive age. Lessons in manufacturing industry would be sought for

¹ In England, at present, the Board of Works has only control over public buildings..

in vain in these books; and lest a better and more advanced class of school-book might possibly find its way into the schools of England, the Resident Commissioner would provide that no books should be used by schools under the "National" Board but those which would be issued by the authority of the Commissioners.

To better carry out the policy of "London Castle" of effacing the nationality of England, no English history would be permitted to be taught in the "National" schools. Irish, Hebrew, French, Roman and other history might form part of the teaching which English boys and girls would receive; but history of England there would be none allowed inside one of the schools of the country. It would be disloyal to teach it. The memory of King Alfred should die so that the exploits of King Brian Boru of Ireland might become familiar to the future fathers and mothers of the English nation. John Hampden and other confessors of English liberty would never be mentioned in the schools of the country which they died to free from kingly despotism, but the exploits of such Irishmen as would have conquered India, wrested Canada from the French, and trampled upon English freedom, would be made as familiar to the youth of England as household words. To add insult to injury, such a system of education would be known as the "National system" of England!

"The Privy Council of England" would be a make-believe English body to whom the Irish Lord-Lieutenant would relegate certain Executive matters. But no popular Englishman would have a seat at its board, nor could any number of the people of England be privileged or empowered to elect any of its members. They would all be appointed through various Irish Lord-Lieutenants, by the influence of the Ring. The two first names would be those of members of the Royal Family of Ireland, who would never attend a meeting of the "Council." The next would be those of the two highest dignitaries of the English

Roman Catholic Church. For the same reason that no Protestant could be a Lord-Lieutenant, no Protestant Bishop could be a member of the "Privy Council of England." Various ex-Lord-Lieutenants, ex-Chief Secretaries, ex-Commanders-in-Chief, all Irish, would follow. Then would come several Anglo-Irish noblemen and landlords; and the list of names would be completed with the Judges who would represent the strength of the Judicial Bench of England under "London Castle."¹

The Privy Council of "London Castle," through its Clerk (who would be, as already described, an Assistant Under Secretary to the Castle), would be one of the most efficient instruments of the "Castle" system of rule that could be wielded against the liberties of a people. The Judges of England—all true, tried, and promoted "Castle" hacks—would practically constitute the Privy Council. They would always be in a majority at its meetings. All proclamations, under which arrests for seditious conspiracy would be made, would be issued by the Privy Council; and amongst the signatures which these documents would bear would be those of the Judges who would afterwards constitute the Court before which the persons arrested under such proclamations would be tried. The people of England would witness this strange spectacle: they would read the edicts of the Privy Council of "London Castle," by which certain districts of their country would be declared to be "disturbed," and they would next witness in the persons of the Judges sent down to try Englishmen on the charge of a disregard of (Irish) law and order, the owners of the names of those who issued the Proclamation.²

¹ In England, at present, the Judges on the Privy Council form the Judicial Committee of that body for purely legal business, and never interfere in matters of State. In Ireland they act as described.

² The following is a copy of a Dublin Castle Proclamation. The asterisks denote the members of the Privy Council signing the Proclamation who were Judges of the land:—

This "Castle Ring" would have many political advisers among the Irish landocracy of England ; but the chief exponents

**"BY THE LORD-LIEUTENANT AND PRIVY COUNCIL OF
IRELAND.**

"PROCLAMATION.

"ABERCORN :

"Whereas by an Act made and passed in a Session of Parliament, holden in the eleventh year of Her Majesty's reign, Chapter II., it was amongst other things enacted and provided that, whenever in the judgment of the Lord-Lieutenant or other chief Governor or Governors of Ireland, by and with the advice of the Privy Council of Ireland, it should be necessary for the prevention of crime and outrage that the said Act should apply to any County . . . in Ireland . . . Now we the Lord-Lieutenant-General, and General Governor of Ireland, do by this our Proclamation in pursuance and execution of the said Act for the better preservation of the Peace in Ireland, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Privy Council in Ireland, declare, that from and after the 12th day of March, in the year of our Lord 1867, the said Act, that is to say the Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act 1856 . . . shall apply to and be in force, in and for all those parts of the Queen's County not included in the above recited Proclamations.

"And of this our Proclamation, all Justices of the Peace of the said Queen's County, and all constables, peace officers, and all others whom it may concern are desired to take notice.

"Given at the Council Chamber, Dublin Castle, this 11th day of March, in the year 1867.

"RICHARD C. DUBLIN.

NAAS.

*** FRED SHAW.**

SAMUEL MEATH.

*** R. KEATINGE.**

J. W. FITZPATRICK.

FITZSTEPHEN FRENCH.

JOHN HATCHELL.

JOSÉPH NAPIER.

*** A. BREWSTER.**

*** JOHN E. WALSH.**

FRANCIS PLUNKET DUNNE.

*** MICHAEL MORRIS.**

"GOD SAVE THE QUEEN."

"The Irish Judge is a composite official fashioned from very incongruous elements. In addition to being a Judge, he is also the Government, the Privy Council, the Castle ; he represents English dominion through the medium of the Viceregal establishment—the most hateful form in which it can be represented to the popular mind—and he is careful to keep his hand in constant practice by exercising the multifarious duties which go to comprise the bizarre nature of his office. When judicially engaged in a political case, for instance, or when charging a Grand Jury on circuit, or whenever an opportunity presents itself, the Judge improves the occasion by delivering a solemn lecture on nearly every subject of current public interest. The flimsiest pretext will sometimes suffice for ventilating the peculiar views of his order or of his party. If an agricultural case appears on the record, he will avail himself of the accident to make commentaries

of its policy and champions of its acts would be two ultra-Irish and rabid Catholic newspapers published in London. The

on the Land Act. It will be an occasion for extolling the Prime Minister, for commending the Lord-Lieutenant, and for saying a good word for the Chief Secretary."—*The Irish Bar Sinister*, p. 45. Simpkin, Marshall and Co., London, 1872.

"In Ireland, that paradise of lawyers, there are (including the Recorder of Dublin, who is practically a County Court Judge) thirty-four Chairmen, or County Court Judges, as they are called on this side of the Channel; in England the number of County Court Judges is fifty-seven. Now when we recollect that the population of England is more than four times and its wealth more than eleven times greater than Ireland's, and when we further ascertain that the jurisdiction of the County Courts is much more extensive than in the latter country, we may well ask, How can the thirty-four Irish Chairmen possibly make out occupation for themselves? That they find it difficult to do so is evident from the Parliamentary Returns which were made out in 1870 and 1871, at the instance of the Right Hon. G. Ward Hunt, from which we learn, that in the year 1869, the average number of days on which each County Court Judge in England sat, was one hundred and forty, while for the same year the average sittings of each Irish Chairman numbered forty-seven days. In other words, if each English County Court Judge performed the same amount of work as each Irish Chairman, and no more, it would take one hundred and seventy Judges to get through the business of the English County Courts; or to reverse the case, if we could prevail upon the Irish Chairmen to work as hard as their English brethren, eleven Chairmen instead of thirty-four would suffice for Ireland. It is doubtless some consolation to the taxpayer to know that if the work of the Irish Chairmen is very small, still, on the other hand, their pay is very large. An English County Court Judge receives a salary which is at the rate of £11 for each day he sits in Court, and from the date of his appointment he must resign all practice at the Bar; the Irish Chairmen, up to the year 1871, received just £20 12s. for each day's sitting, with liberty, moreover, to practise at their profession as much as they pleased. The Irish Land Act (1870) having thrown upon each of the Chairmen additional work, averaging eleven days in each year, these hard-worked and badly-paid public servants raised such a cry, that they succeeded in wringing out of the State additional pay, averaging £221 per annum each."—Article "Irish Judges." *Fortnightly Review*, March 1875.

The origin of the institution of County Chairmen is thus given by the able author of the above:—

"In the year 1798, Lord Clare, who, under the direction of Mr. Pitt and Lord Castlereagh, was moving heaven and earth to carry the Act of Union, found his efforts greatly clogged by the strenuous opposition offered to the measure by the Irish Bar. In December of that year, a meeting of the profession was held, at which, by a majority of 162 to 32, they passed a resolution protesting against the proposed Union, which, they asserted, would entail countless evils upon their country. Lord

editor of one of these papers would be the special correspondent of the chief organ of public opinion in Ireland. The apparent sole object of these journals would be, to offer daily insult to the national feeling of the English people; hold them up to the contempt of Ireland and the world as at one and the same time the best governed and most ungrateful people on the face of the habitable globe; and contend that the only persons in England worth reckoning as civilised beings were the Irish landlords, Irish officials, and pro-Irish section of the English community, who would be all ultramontane Catholics. The general tenor of the writings in these semi-official organs of "London Castle" would be, that there could be no real security for landlord life and property in England, nor peace or prosperity in the land, until Irish statesmen would have the courage to govern the country by means of a continuous suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, abolition of trial by jury, and suppression of all seditious newspapers—which would mean, all anti-Irish or English national journalism.

The "London Castle" Ring thus particularised would comprise about thirty-five persons, and adding the Lord-Lieutenant and Chief Secretary as *ex-officio* members, the united salaries which these individuals would draw from the public taxes of England would amount to over £120,000 per annum. They would have in addition the entire disposition of the revenue of the country in their hands; the management of all Government business; control of all government offices; disposal of some

Clare saw the gravity of the situation; the Bar was a dangerous opponent, and should be silenced. Forthwith he established the system of County Chairmanships, which from that time to the present has constantly supplied thirty-three Irish barristers with salaries ranging from £700 to £1000 per annum, and which has consequently proved very useful, if not to Ireland, at least to her governors. As there were not Judgeships enough vacant to reward each of the thirty-two barristers who voted for the Union, the creation of the Chairmanships was most opportune. Sixteen of them were distributed among such of the thirty-two lawyers as had not received Judgeships."

3000 Government posts; the legal drilling of all resident magistrates in "Castle" tactics; the appointment of all county justices through their created county lord-lieutenants; the appointment of lord-lieutenants and deputy-lieutenants of counties; selection of high sheriffs for counties, and also of cities and boroughs from the lists returned by their municipal bodies to the Lord-Lieutenant, with whom the final selection would remain; appointment of grand juries (through Judges and Castle county high sheriffs), and indirect control over the expenditure of the county rates levied by these unrepresentative and irresponsible bodies.

One of the most serious duties that would devolve upon this "Castle Ring" would be the English State training of the Irishman who should, for the time being, hold the office of Chief Secretary to the Irish Lord-Lieutenant of England. This Minister upon visiting London (probably for the first time) after his appointment by the Irish Cabinet, would be taken in hand by select members of the Ring, and be immediately inoculated with the alarmist doctrines and rule-by-state-of-siege principles which would have obtained in the council chambers of "London Castle" since the time when an Irish Pitt and an English Castlereagh succeeded in robbing the English nation of legislative independence.¹

¹ Lord Hartington (then Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland) in the debate on the Peace Preservation Act, Dec. 9, 1872, said: "I can hardly undertake to describe the feeling of painful dismay with which I undertake the task that is before me, *for in addition to the inexperience and want of acquaintance with Irish affairs which I labour under*, I have to approach that very difficult and painful task which has perplexed English statesmen for many years," &c. Further on in the same speech, Lord Hartington shows how ignorance of Irish affairs, on the part of an English Chief Secretary, can be compensated for by arguments in favour of more coercive laws—the stock remedy of the Castle Ring: "The police have arrested," continued the noble lord, "numerous persons under the provisions of the Act of last year (1871), for being out at night under suspicious circumstances, but in very few instances have the magistrates been able to inflict a penalty, *for the men arrested have always been provided with a reasonable and lawful excuse for being where they were found!*"

Should the new Chief Secretary be imbued with liberal opinions towards the English people, and give any symptoms of coming to the performance of his duties with a mind prepossessed against the promptings of the salaried English underlings who had guided the policy of his predecessor, a serious danger would at once confront the absolutism of the Ring. The wrongs which a stupidly unsympathetic legislation had for generations inflicted upon the English masses might have made some impression upon the mind of the Chief Secretary, to which fact his appointment might be due ; and if, in addition to these dangerous proclivities, he should have the reputation of being a man of independent character, firmness of will, and recognised honesty of purpose, the obstacles that would be thus placed in the way of the continued supremacy of the Ring, would be most formidable.

The genius of the "Castle," however, would be equal to such a critical emergency.

The occasional experience of such more or less perversely-disposed Chief Secretaries would suggest the ways and means by which the newest appointment to the post would be won over to the hereditary policy which generations of absolutism had fixed as that without which constitutional government would become inevitable, and "Castle" rule overthrown, in England.

There is scarcely any feeling so keenly disappointing to a public man as that which results from the suspicion, or seeming discovery, that a people whose cause he has more or less advocated are the ungrateful, perverse, and unworthy nation their enemies have always declared them to be. He may have maintained, in senate and on platform, that such alleged traits of character were foreign to the observed natural dispositions of such people. Or, if their demeanour did occasionally form an unfavourable contrast to that of another race residing among them, it could be both logically and charitably accounted for and extenuated by recollecting the numerous deteriorating moral

and national agencies which centuries of admitted unjust rule had engendered. But let the belief that he was in error, after all, once approach his mind, and he becomes a prey to doubts as to the wisdom of extending popular liberties to them—doubts which accidental circumstances may appear to confirm, and which will ultimately throw him into the arms of a policy without which, he is assured, it will be impossible to keep the people in subjection to the rule of his own country. He feels like a man who was willing to succour a poor cripple who had experienced grievous wrong, but discovers that the police have arrested the object of his sympathy, and convicted him as an impostor. Political sympathy like human law would not, in such an instance, be proof against appearances.

Those influences which in a more or less degree guide the class of public men who are above the consideration of salary in the performance of the duties of responsible statesmanship, are thoroughly understood by the class of mercenary officials who are heard of by the public for the first time when they become berthed in some important Government situation. Salary and the possession of influence for the advancement of self and friends, are everything to them; while motives of self-denial or sacrifices for the common weal are the very principles of public action which threaten with opposition the exercise of such influence and the permanency of such stipends, and are dreaded when recognised in chiefs of departments as a dangerously infectious disease would be by the father of young children.

The advent of a Chief Secretary to power, who by his previous utterances or acts should exhibit any evidence of a reforming spirit, would call forth all the inventive faculties of the "London Castle" Ring. The absence of the popular English leaders from "Castle" levees would be explained as symptomatic of their disloyalty to the Crown, and desire for an English republic. Their speeches to English public meetings would be interpreted as incentives to a breach of law and order, and contempt for

the authority of Ireland in England ; while it would be broadly hinted to the new Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant, that these leaders were in secret alliance with deadly enemies of the Irish empire in America and elsewhere, and that their real purpose was red revolution.

In giving this complexion to the acts and motives of the Gladstones, Brights, Chamberlains, and Forsters of a subjugated England, and in the support of the traditional " Castle " policy, the Ring would have the active aid not only of all the officials throughout the country, but of the entire landed aristocracy also, including its agents, lawyers, and dependants ; and from very obvious and intelligible reasons.

All the land of England would be in the possession of a few thousand Irish and Anglo-Irish peers and commoners, who would hold the same in virtue of certain deeds performed by their ancestors in the conquest of England by Ireland. This right, by force of violence and fraud, together with the entire neglect of duties with a front of brass and exaction of rights by a hand of iron, would make the landocracy hated and dreaded by the mass of the English people. Their rights to the soil of the country would not be worth a month's purchase but for the protecting bayonets of the Royal English Constabulary and an Irish army of occupation, 30,000 strong. But this would not be enough. Physical force must be supplemented by the moral force of civil administration ; consequently all the administrative powers of the country must be either in the hands of the landlords, or in those of their adherents or nominees. Therefore, the incoming Chief Secretary would find Irish rule and the interests of the loyal English class thus " secured " upon taking office.

The direct Government of England would be centralised in " London Castle," and be in the hands of the Ring of permanent officials, as described. The conservatism of mercenary motives in these officials would correspond with the nature of the

"vested interests" of the landlords, and make the continued rule of the one a necessary condition to the upholding of the territorial abuses of the other. The law of reciprocal dependence would render the supremacy of the Ring the perfection of government to the landlords; while the continuance in full swing of the rights, privileges, and monopolies of the latter in levying of county rates, functions of rural magistracy, and dispensation of petty patronage, would be guaranteed them by the Ring, in return for such disinterested confidence.

The Chairmen of Quarter Sessions and County Court Judges, before whom cases of eviction and breaches of landlord privileges would be brought for adjudication, would be the nominees either of the Ring or of the landlords. The high sheriff of a county, in whom would be vested the power of calling the Grand Jury, would be a landlord, while the sub-sheriff would be either another landlord or an agent. The Lord-Lieutenant of each county would be a landlord or a peer, while the various deputy-lieutenants would all be recruited from the same territorial class. Of the four or five thousand rural magistrates, who would be scattered throughout England as Justices of the Peace, eighty per cent. would belong to the class most hostile to the social and political rights of the English people—the landlord class. The resident or stipendiary magistracy would be recruited from retired military and naval officers, ex-inspectors of constabulary (promoted policemen), and legal hangers-on of the Ring.

While the vast majority of the people of England would be of the Protestant religion, not above twenty per cent. of the foregoing administrators of law and justice would be of that faith. Eighty per cent. of England's paid and honorary magistracy would be ultramontane Catholic.¹

¹ By a Return moved for by Mr. Sexton, in Nov. 1882, and which was presented to Parliament during the last Session (1884), it is shown that the Protestant Justices of the Peace in Ireland number 4509, while those of the Catholic faith are but 884. The Protestant population in 1881, including

The Grand Jury system under which county government would be conducted—as in Ireland at present—would work as follows, under a “London Castle” Government :—

The Judges of Assize, who, as already explained, would be promoted “Castle” hacks, and members of the Privy Council to the Irish Lord-Lieutenant, would have the power of submitting the names of persons qualified to act as high sheriffs to the Lord-Lieutenant, who would be empowered to make the final selection. A high sheriff thus selected—who would invariably be a landlord and of strong anti-English feeling—would have the power of “calling” the Grand Jury for the county. This body would necessarily and invariably be composed of county landlords, all pro-Irish in their sympathies, mostly Roman Catholic in religion, and of strong anti-English prejudices. The people in the county would have no more voice in their selection than in the nomination of the President of the French Republic. This landlord and un-English body would have the management of roads, county asylums, &c. The levying and expenditure of county rates would be among its functions, as would also the disposal of such offices and patronage as such fiscal administration would require. If a murder should be committed or property be maliciously injured within any portion of a county thus governed, the Grand Jury would be empowered, upon application by friends of the murdered person or the owner of the injured property, to levy a special tax upon the people of the district in which the deed would have been perpetrated, for compensation to the claimants—though the perpetrator might belong to another county, country, or continent.

The members of the various Boards of Guardians for the administration of England’s Poor Law would be of a mixed

“Church of Ireland,” “Irish Church,” “Protestant Episcopalians,” “Presbyterians,” “Methodists,” “Baptists,” &c., was 1,198,948; the Catholic population 3,960,891.

representative character. The people's guardians and the landlord guardians would be in about equal force, owing to the system of multiple and proxy voting, which would enable the landlord interest to put in by a few landlord multiple votes as many members of the Board as the ratepayers of a whole union. Thus the ex-officio system, by which a landlord or property-holding guardian is entitled to sit for every elected guardian, would virtually hand over the huge machinery of the Poor Law into the hands of the great anti-English land-owning aristocracy. But this would not exhaust the vast centralising power of the "London Castle" Ring. The Local Government Board, already described, would be the virtual controller of the Poor Law administration in England. Everything done by every Board of Guardians would have to be approved of by the Local Government Board. Not a ten-pound note of the people's rates could be expended without every item being submitted to the Local Government Board. A new water-closet in a workhouse at Berwick-on-Tweed could not be erected until plans, specifications, and estimate of costs should first be submitted to the Local Government Board.

Thus from the functions of the Lord-Lieutenant down to the meanest detail in the economy of rural government, everything would be under the absolute rule and control of the "London Castle" Ring on the advent of a new Chief Secretary.

The "police force of England" he would find a purely military body, and entirely under the control of the Ring. Under the "Castle" system he would find six policemen in England to one in Ireland, proportionately to population. They would all be trained in a central depot before entering upon police duties throughout the country. They would be drilled, dressed, and armed like any other military body, and would never be seen without either a rifle or a side-arm. Not a single railway station from Land's End to Berwick but would have two or more of these military police watching the arrival and departure of

The foregoing would be an outline of the government of England under the "Castle" Ring, on the advent of an Irish member of an Irish administration to the post of Chief Secretary to the Irish Lord-Lieutenant of England. The higher branches of the Administration would be under the heads of the various departments—the members of the permanent Ring. The subordinate and provincial part of the same would be in the possession of the landlords, or "Castle" nominees.

Not a solitary individual would he discover in any responsible post of government who would be, in the remotest sense of the word, a representative of the industry, popular feeling, or national longings of the people of England. The millions of tax and rate-paying citizens would be intensely English in everything appertaining to the honour and welfare of their country; but not a voice would they be permitted to have in the actual management of their own national affairs; not a single popular English Nationalist would be found entrusted with administrative responsibility. A law actually prohibiting the chief post of England's government from being held by any person holding the same religious belief as three-fourths of the English nation would brand with an insult the conscientious belief of the English people, and remind them, though religious freedom might have been virtually won by their fathers, that their faith was still a badge of political servitude in the estimation of the rulers of their country—the Irish "Castle" government of England.

LECTURE XXXIII.

POLITICAL CRIME (*continued*).

Castle Rule of the Judicial Bench—Its “Impartiality”—Contrast between the Irish Constabulary Force and the Police System of England—The Irish and English Franchise—English defence of the Dublin Castle System of Government answered.

THAT the preceding lecture presents no fancy or overdrawn sketch of Dublin Castle and its system of ruling Ireland, few will venture to doubt who are familiar with the way in which the Irish people are governed. The law of the Castle has never commanded more than forced obedience, because there has existed, and there does still exist, in the popular mind of the country, the conviction that such law is not and cannot be impartial under the system which enforces it. While the vast majority of our people are treated as enemies, denied the ordinary privileges of free citizens, and ostracised from every responsible function in the government of their country, a small class, alien in almost every respect to the feelings and wants of the Irish nation, is permitted to speak and write and do almost whatever its ascendancy interests may require, no matter what law or precept of government may be virtually trampled upon by such procedure. What wonder, then, that there have been, and are still, treasons and plots among wronged and insulted Irishmen to overthrow this detested and miserable despotism? If such a system of government should fall to the lot of Englishmen, is there a man with English blood in his veins, and feeling for the honour of his country, who would not plot, plan, and conspire to

hurl such an infamous rule into the Thames? There never can and there never will be peace in Ireland, or a respect for the administration of law, while its sensitive people see their beloved fatherland and their own rights and liberties in the clutches of a Ring of unscrupulous mercenaries, who flaunt the stigma of official, race, and religious ascendancy before their face in almost every transaction of administrative government.

In the law proceedings and administration of justice in England, the judge is expected to be, and invariably is, either a neutral power between the accused and the Crown which prosecutes, or an umpire who inclines more or less to the side of the accused until his guilt is clearly established. But who can truly say that this is the character of the Irish Judicial Bench? There is not a score of people in Ireland, outside of the landlord and ascendancy faction, that would not count upon having the judge as an assisting public prosecutor on the Crown side, if arraigned for any offence against the property of the landlords or law of the Castle.

The two latest instances of this open partisanship of the Castle judicial bench happened in connection with the recent State trial, "*The Queen v. Parnell and others.*" A few weeks previous to the commencement of the trial, two of the traversers brought an action for attachment against one of the organs of the Castle, for certain libellous statements that were deemed prejudicial to the chances of a fair trial. The case against the proprietor of this paper was argued by Mr. Macdonagh, Q.C., on behalf of Messrs. Parnell and Egan, and was heard by Lord Chief Justice May and Mr. Justice O'Brien. The conduct of the Chief Justice, however, was characterised by such violent and open partisanship against the traversers, whose trial was immediately pending, that the whole press of Great Britain and Ireland—the two organs of Dublin Castle excepted—cried shame upon the intemperate harangue of which Judge May delivered himself from the bench; and he was, in consequence, compelled by

force of public opinion to retire from any further part in the trial of Parnell and co-traversers.

No such conduct would be heard of from a judge in England now-a-days, yet Judge May is still one of the heads of English law in Ireland, drawing his salary of £5000 a-year from the taxes of its people.

The other instance of a Castle Judge acting as assistant to the Attorney-General was on the occasion of the State trial just referred to. Mr. Justice Fitzgerald was the president of the court, owing to the compulsory withdrawal of Chief Justice May; and the whole of the traversers without exception accepted him as an advocate for the Crown, having a sympathetic brief from the landlords, with a seat on the bench. Nor did the sequel belie their expectations. In his interruptions of the traversers' counsel, and whole demeanour and conduct during the trial, a looker-on could not possibly recognise a single instance or occurrence which would lead to the most charitable opinion being formed of his impartiality. His summing up to the jury was an elaborate and envenomed indictment of the Land League (up to Christmas of 1880), and supplementary speech for the Crown to that of Attorney-General Law. After the jury returned into court, and one of their number informed his lordship that ten were for an acquittal and but two for conviction, Judge Fitzgerald became white with rage, turned upon the unfortunate jurymen, rated him for mentioning the numbers, and then loudly called upon the High Sheriff to bring in sufficient police to clear the court in case any emergency should arise, and—ordered the jury back to their room.

Such, however, is the frequency of these exhibitions of partisanship on the Irish bench that the Irish people cease to wonder at them. They accept such administration of Castle law as one of the many evils inseparable from the rule of that institution; and their undisguised contempt for and antipathy towards such parodies upon justice is but the necessary result of

the whole system of Irish government as centred in the establishment on Cork Hill, Dublin.

Glaring as is the contrast between the judicial bench of the two countries, that between the two police systems is still more so. In England "Bobby" is a "popular institution." It very rarely happens that he "runs in" the wrong man, nor can disturbers of the peace or enemies of other people's property hold his vigilance, intelligence, or pluck in defiance or contempt. Yet he is never seen with a rifle slung across his shoulders, or met with a buckshot-pouch and bayonet at his side. He would probably feel as awkward if thus equipped in the task of keeping the peace among his fellow-countrymen as they, on their part, would look astonished and indignant at such an un-English spectacle as a soldier-policeman. "Bobby's" truncheon is at once the symbol of his authority as a public officer and the only weapon with which the law permits him to defend himself in the discharge of his duty. Even when called upon to assist in quelling a riot, he is never seen with any other weapon but his baton. Firing upon crowds and killing little boys and girls by such wanton and infamous licence as frequently characterises the action of the Royal Irish Constabulary would create a feeling of such indignation, if perpetrated in England, as would hurl any ministry from office that should appear to sanction such butchery by a police force.

The results of totally opposite systems of unarmed police under local and municipal control in England, and armed soldiers termed constabulary under Castle administration in Ireland, is clearly seen in the respective attitudes of the English and Irish people towards the particular force of each country. An Englishman loves individual liberty and respects the law which recognises his right to that privilege of free-citizenship; therefore he holds in equal respect the law and its agents, which are never associated in his mind with any other duty than what is to his advantage as a member of society—the duty of defending the

property of the community from its enemies and preserving the peace from disturbers. The Irishman has an equal if not a more passionate attachment to freedom of movement, speech, and action, with a corresponding enmity towards whatever maintains a continued espionage upon any or all of these prerogatives of personal liberty. He can, therefore, have no feeling of respect towards the Royal Irish Constabulary, because he knows that it is an Imperial political force, having none of the qualities of a police body, and that its extra-political duty and *raison d'être* is to form a body-guard for the system of Irish landlordism.

In England and Scotland the expense of both County Constabulary and Borough Police is defrayed mostly out of local rates, for the well-known reason that Englishmen would object to have such an important factor in the administration of their country under the complete control of even their own (centralised) government. Hence the police of Great Britain are under the control of and dependent upon the local or municipal powers.

In Ireland, as already pointed out, the case is entirely reversed. Since 1846 the charge of supporting the Irish Constabulary has been undertaken by the Imperial government, for what purpose and policy is easy to discern; and the annual cost of this Imperial force is considerably over £1,000,000. While Scotland has but a police force less than 5000, and England and Wales less than 15,000 (not counting the Metropolitan force), Ireland, with 5,000,000 of people, has over 11,000 constabulary, exclusive of the city of Dublin police!

From the manner in which this army of political police is distributed throughout Ireland, its equipment, *esprit de corps*, and high pay, it is ridiculous to regard it in any other light than that of 11,000 added to the 30,000 other Imperial troops which make up the physical force government of Ireland.

"But," I think I hear you say, "you have the same franchise in Ireland as in England, and to that extent, at least, your country is not unjustly treated."

Let us see what facts and figures have to say in reply to this erroneous statement (Thom's 'Official Almanac,' 1880).

The Irish franchise is distributed over 170,698 county electors, 57,290 city and borough, and 3548 for Trinity College, Dublin; giving a total number of parliamentary voters to Ireland of 231,536.

England (including Wales) has 903,658 county electors, 1,584,877 for her cities and boroughs, and 13,141 for her Universities; or a total of 2,501,676 parliamentary voters; being 2,270,140 more than Ireland.

England, with little over *four* times the population of Ireland, has *ten* times the number of electors. One in every nine Englishmen is privileged to vote in England; one in every twenty-four Irishmen in Ireland.

The Province of Ulster, comprising nine counties, and having a population of 1,312,879, has 15,966 voters *less* than Birmingham and Nottingham, in England, with but a little more than one-third as many people.

The two provinces of Munster and Leinster, comprising eighteen counties, with a population (not counting that of cities or boroughs) of 2,674,000, have 6218 *less* voters than the two English counties of Cheshire and Derbyshire, having less than one million of people. Dublin, Limerick, Cork, Athlone, Waterford, Mallow, Drogheda, Dundalk, Kilkenny, Ennis, Clonmel, Bandon, Tralee, Carlow, Dungarvan, Wexford, New Ross, Portarlinton, and Youghal, cities and boroughs of Leinster and Munster, having a united population of 585,000, have 21,820 voters *less* between them, than the two English boroughs of Salford and Hull, with but a united population of 250,000.

The entire province of Connaught, with over 850,000 people, has 1718 voters *less* than Stoke-upon-Trent, English borough, with a population of 131,000.

Finally Glasgow has 2630 more voters than all the cities and boroughs of Ireland combined; Yorkshire has 180,000 more

than all the Irish counties, while Lancashire has near 120,000 more voters than the whole of Ireland put together.

In English Boroughs, *all* rated Householders (whose rates have been paid) are entitled to votes, and, by a late decision of English judges, every room separately held has been considered a "house" under the 1867 Reform Act.

In Irish Boroughs, only rated householders whose houses are *valued by Government* at *over* £4 per annum (equal to a yearly rental of £8 in Ireland, or £10 or £12 in England), and occupiers of lodgings worth 4s. per week (unfurnished), or over, are entitled to votes.

As a consequence, Irish boroughs have less than half as many Parliamentary voters, in proportion to population, as English boroughs.

In English and Irish counties, the Occupiers' Franchise is nominally the same (£12 Government valuation), but from a difference in the methods of valuing, and other causes, English counties have more than one-and-a-half times as many voters in proportion to population as Irish counties.

Let us next see what differences there are between the two countries in respect to the municipal franchise.

In England every person, *male* or *female*, who has occupied for twelve months any house rated to the poor, is entitled to the Municipal Franchise.

In Ireland, in all towns except Dublin, every *man* only, who has occupied a house rated at *the Government value* of £10 (equal to a rental of £17 in Ireland, or, say, £22 in England), is entitled to the Municipal Franchise. In Dublin, though the suffrage is ostensibly household, yet the necessity of three years' residence, and the rating of landlords, instead of occupiers, together with the non-rating of quarterly tenants, annihilate the household franchise.

As a consequence, English towns have from *four* to *seven* times as many voters, for Municipal purposes, as Irish towns.

I think I have successfully negatived in the foregoing lectures the frequent assertions of Englishmen, that Ireland is governed as England is governed—according to the British Constitution. Government by physical force is contrary to both the letter and spirit of that palladium of British liberty. Its aversion to despotism is such that it places within the power of the elected representatives of the English people to curtail, or even to abolish, the army and navy (by the provisions of the Mutiny Act) during any session of Parliament, as a safeguard against a possible attempt on the part of the monarch to misuse the nation's forces against popular rights. But the popular liberty so jealously guarded on one side of the Irish Sea is placed entirely at the mercy of an anti-national and unpopular clique or Ring on the other. A system of rule analogous to that for which the Stuart dynasty was kicked out of England is thus maintained by English statesmen over the Irish people in the name of Constitutional government! The rights and liberties of the Irish people are in the hands of a corps of anti-Irish officials. In the appointment of these officials the people of Ireland have no voice whatever; either directly or through their Parliamentary representatives. Questions can be asked in the House of Commons, and appointments can be criticised, of course; but six times the whole Irish representation in Parliament can be counted upon to stand by any English Minister who is determined to defend a Castle official against a representative of the country which that official helps to rule for an Anglo-Irish Ring and an English party.

I will now endeavour to meet and answer such arguments in defence of Castle rule as are ordinarily advanced by Englishmen who admit it to be an exceptional but necessary system of government for Ireland.

“The continual presence of a large proportion of the British army and the maintenance of a special military police are

needed in Ireland to uphold Imperial supremacy, and to meet any attempt on the part of the Irish people to separate the two countries."

This but concedes to my contention that England's rule of Ireland is government by physical force, and not by constitutional methods. Such an argument, moreover, makes two admissions that are equally damaging to the institution which they are meant to defend :—(1st.) After seven centuries of rule by physical force, the Irish people are admittedly still disaffected towards England. (2nd.) A system of government which thus persists in keeping alive a feeling of hostility to its rule among the people governed, needs no other condemnation. It stands self-condemned.

"But was not the Act of Union the work of an Irish Parliament, sitting in Dublin?"

Yes; a Parliament of Anglo-Irish landlords, bribed by Lord Castlereagh, as all history acknowledges, to destroy the Irish legislature. A measure passed in this manner, under pressure of an insurrection which was most wickedly and with malice aforethought fomented by Dublin Castle, to aid the treacherous policy of Pitt in terrorising an exclusively Protestant Irish House of Commons into a surrender of its existence, cannot well be said to have been placed upon the statute-book with the sanction of the Irish people. Hundreds of thousands of the people of Ireland, Protestants and Catholics, petitioned against the Act at the time. O'Connell's great Repeal movement was organised to repudiate and overthrow it. The '48 movement was born of the national detestation of the system which the Act of Union substituted for Home Government. Fenianism arose to achieve national independence, as a consequence of the Castle system. Home Rule drew its inspiration from the popular aversion to the Act of Union; and sixty-four Irish representatives in the present Parliament are returned, by even a limited franchise, to demand the undoing of the measure

which has given us Dublin Castle rule for a Dublin House of Commons. The national will of Ireland has never for a moment acquiesced in the Act of Union. Irish popular opposition to it has never ceased during the last eighty-two years, as fifty-two Coercion Acts passed during that period by the Imperial Parliament at the instigation of Dublin Castle most significantly attest; and the longer English statesmen continue to uphold this most unholy union, the more fierce will grow the determination of the Irish race throughout the world to have it repealed, and the larger the number of Coercion Acts that will yet have to be added to those which already illustrate the imbecility of the rule of which they are the inevitable outcome.

“The Castle system centralises the power of our garrison in Ireland, and enables it to cope all the more effectively with the elements of disaffection.”

Let me briefly examine the record of this centralised garrison, and see what it has accomplished for the power which it “protects” and represents.

Has it subdued the people of Ireland to a willing acceptance of English rule? No.

Has its administration of the law succeeded in winning popular confidence and respect? Just the reverse: Its Judges are mistrusted, its juries generally believed to be packed, its police hated, its authority defied, and the name and power of English Government, represented by this garrison, held in undisguised detestation by four-fifths of our population.

Are the chiefs of this garrison either feared by the Irish people, so as to inspire respect, or respected as the result of having performed their duty to the country? The contrary is the fact. Their power is defied at the present moment by one thousand representative Irish Nationalists, who are incarcerated in Irish prisons because they are “reasonably suspected” of being inimical to the entire garrison. The country, knowing that this act is perpetrated by England’s Irish Executive in its

character as the instrument of landlordism, cannot help despising a Government which coerces the majority of a country in order to sustain the unjust power of a class. Neither the English Lord-Lieutenant nor the Chief Secretary dare travel through Ireland without a military or police protection. No Government official could obtain a hearing from the people in any part of three provinces if notice of the meeting were published beforehand. While the imprisoned popular leaders are loved and their names cheered by the people, their Castle jailers are hated, and the mention of their names groaned at every public gathering. Finally, not one of these officials would stand the ghost of a chance of being elected by the Irish people to any position of public trust in their power to give.

Let us now, on the other hand, summarise the record of this garrison as far as the country and people subjected to its rule are concerned.

What have been its fruits to Ireland? A loss of three millions of population during the past forty years; emigration still depopulating the country; periodical famines, through the operation of an admittedly infamous system of Land Laws; land continually going out of cultivation; over two millions of people living in one-roomed, mud-walled cabins; manufacturing industry all but dead in three provinces, and languishing in the fourth; an agrarian revolution raging throughout the country at the present moment against the cause of this depopulation, poverty, squalor, industrial stagnation and social anarchy; agrarian murders and outrages of frequent occurrence; moral ruin of thousands of virtuous Irish girls, who are compelled to leave the protecting influences of their homes through what amounts to compulsory expatriation; and the following Coercion Acts during the last fifty years:

1830. Importation of Arms Act.

1831. Act to Prevent Tumultuous Assemblies, known as "the White-boy Act."

- 1831. Stanley's Arms Act.
- 1832. Importation of Arms and Gunpowder Act.
- 1833. Change of Venue Act.
- 1834. Suppression of Disturbances Amendment and Continuance Act.
- 1834. Another Importation of Arms and Gunpowder Act.
- 1835. Public Peace Act.
- 1836. Another Arms Act.
- 1838. Ditto Ditto
- 1839. Unlawful Oaths Act.
- 1840. Another Arms Act.
- 1841. Outrages Act.
- 1841. Another Arms Act.
- 1843. Act consolidating all previous Coercion Acts.
- 1844. Unlawful Oaths Act.
- 1845. Additional Constables near Public Works Act.
- 1845. Unlawful Oaths Act.
- 1846. Constabulary Force Enlargement Act.
- 1847. Crime and Outrage Act.
- 1848. Treason Amendment ("Treason Felony") Act.
- 1848. Removal of Arms Act.
- 1848. Suspension of Habeas Corpus Act.
- 1848. Another Oaths Act.
- 1849. Suspension of Habeas Corpus Act.
- 1850. Crime and Outrage Act.
- 1851. Unlawful Oaths Act.
- 1853. Crime and Outrage Act.
- 1854. Ditto Ditto
- 1855. Ditto Ditto
- 1856. Peace Preservation Act.
- 1858. Ditto Ditto
- 1860. Ditto Ditto
- 1862. Ditto Ditto
- 1862. Unlawful Oaths Act.
- 1865. Peace Preservation Act.
- 1865. (August) Suspension of Habeas Corpus Act.
- 1866. Suspension of Habeas Corpus Act.
- 1867. Ditto Ditto
- 1868. Ditto Ditto
- 1870. Peace Preservation Act.
- 1871. Protection of Life and Property Act.
- 1871. Peace Preservation Continuance Act.
- 1873. Peace Preservation Act.
- 1875. Peace Preservation Act (for five years).
- 1875. Unlawful Oaths Act.
- 1881. An Act for the better protection of Life and Property.¹

It may be objected, by such Englishmen as are not familiar with the facts of recent Irish history, that the foregoing Coercion

¹ Since the above list was compiled, the Prevention of Crimes Act (1882) and the Arms Act (1882) have been added to post-Union coercive legislation.

Acts were measures which the perverse lawlessness of Irish character rendered necessary on the part of a just and enlightened Government, which that of England is generally declared to be by those who believe their country can do no wrong.

For the information of such people, I will quote from the following sources what English writers, statesmen, and journalists have said of Irish government and Irish landlordism, within the same period covered by the above Coercion Acts—the lifetime of the present generation.

“With the Government in Ireland, ‘the gallows is the only preacher of righteousness.’”—*Froude, English in Ireland*.

“Is a system which can only be supported by brute force, and is kept up by constant blood-shedding, to be perpetuated for ever? Are we still to garrison a defenceless country in behalf of those whose property was, generally speaking, originally conferred on the special condition of residence, but whose desertion occasions all the evils under which she has groaned for centuries?—*property so treated, that it would not be worth a day's purchase, were the proprietors its sole protectors*. But they are aware that their absence is balanced by the presence of a body of military and police, which enables them to conduct themselves with as little apprehension as remorse. The possessions of the entire empire would be lost were such conduct general; and are these so meritorious a class, that their utmost demands are to be extorted from a distant and suffering country, and themselves protected in the open neglect, or rather audacious outrage, of all those duties, on the due and reciprocal discharge of which the whole frame of the social system is founded? If they persist in this course, let them do so, but let it be at their own proper peril.”—Mr. Sadler (Tory), M.P., *Ireland and its Evil*, 1839, p. 161-2.

“We have made Ireland—I speak it deliberately—we have made it the most degraded and miserable country in the world. All the world is crying shame upon us, but we are equally callous to our ignominy and to the results of our misgovernment.”—*Lord John Russell*.

“The people of England have most culpably connived at a national iniquity. Property ruled with savage and tyrannical

sway. It exercised its rights with a hand of iron, and renounced its duties with a front of brass. The 'fat of the land, the flower of its wheat,' its 'milk and its honey,' flowed from its shores in tribute. It was all drain and no return. But if strength and industry fared but ill in a land where Capital was in perpetual flux and decay, how much more poverty and weakness? In an integral part of the British Empire, on the soil trodden by a British sovereign, the landowner was allowed to sweep away the produce of the earth without leaving even a gleanings for them that were ready to perish. And they did perish year by year continually from sheer destitution. England studiously winked at this tyranny. Ready enough to vindicate political rights, it did not avenge the poor. It is now paying for that connivance."—*London Times*, Feb. 25, 1847.

"In this self-defensive war, they (the Irish) cannot cope with the armed power of England in the open field; and they are driven upon the criminal resource of the oppressed in all ages and all lands—secret combination. They feel no remorse; first, because it is *war*—just as the soldier feels no remorse for killing the enemy in a battle; and, secondly, because their conquerors, and the successors of those conquerors, have taught them too well, by repeated examples, the terrible lesson of making light of human life. Poor, ignorant creatures, they cannot see that, while the most illustrious noblemen in England won applause and honours by shooting down Irish women and children like seals or otters, the survivors of the murdered people should be execrated as cruel, barbarous, and infamous for shooting the men that pull down the roof-trees over the heads of their helpless families, and trample upon their household gods. These convictions of theirs are very revolting to our feelings, but they are facts; and as facts the legislature must deal with them. If there be a people *singularly free from crime*, who regard the assassination of the members of a certain class with indifference or approbation, the phenomenon is one which political philosophy ought to be able to explain, and one which *cannot be got rid of by suspending the Constitution* and bringing railing accusations against the nation."—*Godkin: Land War in Ireland*.

Among the many acts of baseness branding the English character in their blundering pretence of governing Ireland, not

the least was the practice of *confiscating the land*, which, by Brehon laws, belonged to the people, and giving it not to honest resident cultivators (which might have been a politic sort of theft), but to cliques of greedy and grasping oligarchs which did nothing for the country they had appropriated, *but suck its blood in the name of RENT*, and squander its resources under the name of pleasure, and fashion, and courtliness in London.”—*Landlords and Laws*, by Prof. John Stuart Blackie, in *Contemporary Review* for January, 1880.

“Neither liberty of the press nor liberty of the person exists in Ireland. Arrests are at all times liable. It is a fact that at any time in Ireland the police may enter into your house, examine your papers to see if there is any resemblance between the writing and that of some anonymous letter that has been sent to a third person. In Ireland, if a man writes an article in a newspaper and it offends the Government, he has a warning, and if he repeats the offence his paper may be suppressed. They say Ireland is peaceful. Yes; but she is so not because she is contented, but because she is HELD UNDER BY COERCIVE LAWS. These laws may be necessary. I am not here objecting to them. I am a Tory, and, as such, I might favour severer laws myself. But I say it is not honest in the Liberals, whilst denouncing us, to imitate our ways.”—*Speech of Benjamin Disraeli*, Feb. 10, 1874.

“It is not in human nature—and all history teaches this—that men should be content under a system of legislation and of institutions such as exist in Ireland. You may pass this (Coercion) Bill; you may put men in jail; you may suppress conspiracy; but the moment it is suppressed there will still remain the germs of the malady, and from those germs will grow up, as heretofore, another crop of disaffection—another harvest of misfortunes. And those members of this House—y younger it may be than I am—who may be here eighteen years hence may find another Ministry proposing to them another administration of the same ever-failing and poisonous medicine.”¹—*John Bright, Coercion Bill Debate*, 1866.

¹ The Right Honourable gentleman has verified this prophecy in his own person. A Liberal Ministry of which he was a member received his support, by speech and vote, in passing some of the most despotic Coercion Acts which ever received the sanction of the Parliament of England, those of 1881 and 1882.

The Irish circumstances and the Irish ideas as to social and agricultural economy are the general ideas and the circumstances of the human race. It is the English ideas and circumstances that are peculiar. Ireland is in the main stream of human existence and human feeling and opinion. It is England that is in one of the lateral channels."—*John Stuart Mill: Hansard*, 17th May, 1866.

"I must say, from all accounts and from my own observation, that the state of our fellow-countrymen in the parts I have named is worse than that of any people in the world, let alone Europe. I believe that these people are made as we are, that they are patient beyond belief, loyal, but at the same time broken-spirited and desperate, living on the verge of starvation in places in which we would not keep our cattle. The Bulgarians, Anatolians, Chinese, and Indians are better off than many of them are. . . . I am not well off, but I would offer Lord Bantry or his agent [Mr. J. W. Payne, J.P.] £1000 if either of them would live one week in one of these poor devil's places, and feed as these people do."—*General Gordon: Letter from Glengarriff, County Cork, to The Times*, December 3rd, 1880.

"The most serious and clear-minded of the exponents of Liberal ideas, talks sometimes as if a good Land Bill would settle everything. It will not; and it is deceiving ourselves to hope that it will. This can be brought about only by doing perfect justice to Ireland, not in one particular matter only, but in all the matters where she has suffered great wrong."—*Matthew Arnold*.¹

As a fitting commentary on the system of rule under which these Coercion Acts have been passed for Ireland, I may add,

¹ "The centralisation of the Government was one of the great plagues of the country. Well, immediately after the first Reform Act it was proposed to grant municipal reform to Ireland, but it was opposed by a majority of the House of Lords. It was opposed in 1835, 1836, 1837, 1838, 1839. It passed, I think, in all these years—certainly in nearly all these years it passed the House of Commons and was rejected in the House of Lords (hear, hear). And in the year 1840, at last, it was passed, but passed in a mutilated form, and passed, for instance, with a higher franchise different from the franchise in England, so that the brand should still be left upon that country."—*Mr. Gladstone, Corn Exchange Meeting, Edinburgh*, August 31st, 1884.

that there were no less than twenty-eight Bills introduced into Parliament by Irish members between 1870 and 1880, with the object of lessening the social evils of Irish landlordism (and thereby promoting the interests of law and order), not a single one of which was placed upon the Statute book.

Let me now ask, in all seriousness, a few questions *apropos* of the foregoing facts: Suppose that instead of applying to Ireland under England's rule, they could be related of Venetia under Austria, Bulgaria under Turkey, or Poland subjected to Russian rule; and supposing, again, that one thousand Italians, Bulgarians, or Poles, were arrested and imprisoned, *without trial*, for open and constitutional efforts to overthrow the cause of such wrongs to their country; would English statesmen designate them "village ruffians," and English papers applaud the Government which should imprison them? Would not English sympathy, on the contrary, be voiced, and generous English assistance not be readily volunteered to the men who would be thus battling against an odious tyranny? If Ireland were only situated by the Danube, and had Turkey or Russia in the position which England now occupies towards "The Sister Island," with a record of centuries of struggle for national as against Turkish or Russian rule; would English prejudice stand arrayed against her aspirations for self-government?

The eighty years which have elapsed since the Act of Union and which have sufficed to bring Ireland to the condition just described, have seen what was a British Colony, almost as stupidly governed as Ireland, develop, when freed from the trammels of alien rule, into one of the most powerful and progressive nations in the world. Had it been possible for English statesmanship to have crushed out the spirit of American independence, before Liberty had won that continent for itself and mankind, the United States might be to-day a trans-Atlantic counterpart of a discontented Ireland. Within the same period we have seen France delivered more or less from the deadly

sway of social and Bourbon servitude, and find herself, at the present hour, a Republic, however imperfect, as well as a fairly prosperous and progressive nation. Prussia, from being a small kingdom of Germany, has become the first of European military powers, and the greatest of European Empires. Italy,¹ when Ireland had her own Parliament, was divided into petty kingdoms and dukedoms, while being, at the same time, a prey for her powerful neighbours, France and Austria, to plunder and conquer at will. To-day she is a United Nation, and almost the equal of her former masters in the councils of Europe. Russia, though still an odious despotism, has progressed from the confines of barbarism and political insignificance to a position which places her second in importance to no other of her contemporary empires. England, within the same span of time, has reached the very pinnacle of political and commercial greatness. Belgium is a still more telling instance of the transforming power which corporate nationhood has exercised in recent years over the social fortunes of an industrious people; whilst Greece, from being the degraded vassal of the Mussulman at a time when Ireland was self-ruled, is now, with a recognised national existence, a living evidence of the elevating power of self-government over the demoralising tendencies of political subjection. In no single instance in modern history do we find a people who have won the right of ruling themselves, or to whom political autonomy

¹ "Half a century ago, what was Italy? An idling-place of dilettanteism or of itinerant motiveless wealth, a territory parcelled out for papal sustenance, dynastic convenience, and the profit of an alien Government. What were the Italians? No people, no voice in European counsels, no massive power in European affairs; a race thought of in English and French society as chiefly adapted to the operatic stage, or to serve as models for painters, disposed to smile gratefully at the reception of half pence, and by the more historical remembered to be rather polite than truthful; in all probability a combination of Machiavelli, Rubini, and Massaniello. Thanks, chiefly, to the Divine gift of memory which inspires the moment with the past, present, and future, and gives the sense of corporate existence that raises man above the otherwise more respectable and innocent brute—all that, or most of it, is changed."—George Eliot, in *The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep! Theophrastus Such*, p. 261.

has been conceded, retrograding either in civilisation, material prosperity, the arts, or sciences.

"But, if we abolished the Castle, repealed the Act of Union, and granted you self-government, you would use an Irish Parliament as a means for effecting total separation and the establishment of an Irish Republic."

The best reply to this stock objection to our just demand for self-government, is to see, by a comparison of actual facts, whether Ireland could *possibly* separate herself from Great Britain, without the consent of England or the fall of her greatness.

FACTS RELATIVE TO

GREAT BRITAIN		and	IRELAND.
Population, 1881—30,190,920			5,088,079
Wealth—£?			£—Nothing in comparison
Army			None
Militia			None
Volunteers } —626,123			None
Navy—81,318 men			None
.. —594 war vessels			None

Great Britain united in maintaining connection with Ireland.

One-fifth of Irish population averse to total separation.

"Well, suppose we admit the impossibility of separation under such conditions; would not the Roman Catholic majority persecute the Protestant minority under a native parliament? Would not 'Home Rule' mean Rome Rule?"

Nothing of the kind. The religious interests and other rights of Irish Protestants would be as safe from molestation in an Irish parliament as they are to-day in that of Westminster. Why not? They are Irishmen; and it is as Irishmen, and not as Catholics, that Irish Nationalists are striving for the self-government of their country. Without the influence arising from the sacrifices and the teachings of Irish Protestants like Tone, Fitzgerald, Emmet, the Sheares, Flood, Grattan, Curran, Mitchell, Martin, and others, the Irish National cause would not possess the vitality which it has to-day. The canonised political saints

of Ireland's struggle for nationhood during the last one hundred years are chiefly Protestant ; and any Irish parliament which would dare to deny to a countryman of Robert Emmet's faith the same religious, social, and political rights which might be won for all the Irish people, would be repudiated by the mass of the Catholics of Ireland. There is not in any civilised country in the world a body so free from political bias on account of religious differences, as the Catholic Hierarchy and priesthood of Ireland ; nor a people so indifferent to " religion in politics " as Irish Catholics. This is so obvious to every student of Irish political life that evidence to substantiate its correctness is unnecessary. Where then is there any reasonable ground for the supposition, that an Irish parliament, elected on manhood or universal suffrage, would be inimical to the Protestants of Ulster ?

His Holiness the Pope, as head of the Catholic Church throughout the world, can have no special desire to see self-government granted to Ireland, except in so far as he is influenced by moral considerations to desire the triumph of justice. A native parliament could not make Ireland more Catholic than she is to-day. It would not convert Ulster to Catholicism to have her send one-fourth of Ireland's representatives to legislate in Dublin in company with the members from the other provinces ; all of whom would no more be Catholic than would those from the north be all Protestant. It would rather tend to give our Protestant fellow-countrymen greater prominence in the public life of the most Catholic people of Europe, than they now exercise, to have them conspicuously represented in Dublin.

Viewed from the stand-point of the head of the Catholic Church, then, the concession to Ireland of a measure which would transfer forty or fifty Roman Catholic members from the most conspicuous legislative Protestant assembly in the world, to a Parliament House in Dublin, could be no victory for the cause of the Catholic Church. The interests of the Universal Church must be paramount to those of Irish nationality with

the Vatican. Would those interests be as equally represented and as faithfully guarded in a British House of Commons, having no Roman Catholics among its members, as when forty or fifty Irish members are present to defend their faith from misrepresentation and the Sovereign Pontiff from the attacks of enemies? This is how the question of Irish self-government *must* be viewed by the Propaganda, and if, as no one will deny, the interests of the Church *are* of greater moment to the Vatican than those of Irish nationality, the granting of a local parliament to Ireland could not be viewed with any extreme satisfaction by Pope Leo XIII. It would leave the Parliament of the British Empire—an empire embracing many million Roman Catholics—almost without a single Roman Catholic representative; while many men of Mr. Bradlaugh's opinions may confidently be reckoned upon as members of that assembly after the next extension of the franchise.

“Well, supposing we made the Irish leader Chief Secretary and a member of the English Cabinet, and allowed him to re-official Dublin Castle out of his own following, would that not satisfy the Irish people and abate the popular demand for an Irish parliament?”

Most certainly not. It is not only a question of officials, but one of principles of government that is at the bottom of the Anglo-Irish strife. Our grievance is national, as well as constitutional and social, and none but a national and constitutional remedy will suffice for its removal. It is well that this should be clearly understood by Englishmen. We demand the restoration of the right to make our own laws, to rule our own country. This right we have never voluntarily surrendered; and without its restitution by the power which deprived us of it, there can be no real peace in Ireland while one liberty-loving Irish nationalist is alive.

Apart from the injuries inflicted upon Ireland through Castle rule, what are our claims to the right and advantages of nation-

hood? John Stuart Mill lays down¹ the doctrine that "a portion of mankind may be said to constitute a nationality, if they are united among themselves by common sympathies which do not exist between them and any others—which make them co-operate with each other more willingly than with other people, desire to be under the same government, and desire that it should be government by themselves, or a portion of themselves exclusively. This feeling of nationality may have been generated by a variety of causes. Sometimes it is the effect of identity of race and descent; community of language and community of religion greatly contribute to it. Geographical limits are one of its causes. But the strongest of all is identity of political antecedents; the possession of a national history, and consequent community of recollections; collective pride and humiliation, pleasure and regret, connected with the same incidents in the past." The Irish people, both in their antecedents and present political attitude, fulfil all these conditions of distinct nationality. The struggles from 1172 on to 1642, 1782, 1798, 1800, 1803, 1829, 1844, 1848, 1867, 1879-80-81, attest the unbroken character of our resistance in one form or another, to a power which denied us the right of ruling ourselves. From 1172 until the present hour, we have contended as a distinct nationality, against what Charles James Fox declared to be "the false and abominable presumption that the English could legislate better for the Irish than they could do for themselves—a presumption founded on the most arrogant tyranny." The root of the Anglo-Irish difficulty, therefore, is not altogether who shall administer, but who shall make the laws of Ireland. We do not want the Castle system reformed. We demand its abolition.²

¹ *Representative Government*, chapter xvi.

² "No Government can exist in any country that is not based upon one of two things, conquest or the good-will of the governed. The Czar's rule is based upon the first of these, our own upon the second. Which of these is it that supports the Irish Government? Ask of the soldiers that garrison

[NOTE.—Of the many fallacies which make up the sum-total of the ordinary Englishman's ignorance of his country's rule of Ireland, there is none so firmly believed in as that which asserts that the government of "the Sister Island" is a most costly business to the British tax-payer. John Bull's housekeeping expenses would, in the opinion of nine out of every ten Britons, be considerably reduced if Ireland were only "cast off," and compelled by the disassociation to keep house for herself. To maintain the connection, therefore, is, according to the aforesaid prevalent English belief, an act of political charity on the part of England for which she receives in return the proverbial ingratitude of the Irish people. To explode this fallacy is an easy task. Facts and figures are the only arguments required to accomplish it. By a parliamentary return which was laid on the table of the House of Commons last March, it appears that the cost of governing Ireland during the year 1882-3 was £7,110,000. Not only was this sum contributed by Ireland herself to the Imperial Exchequer—strange as it may appear to the incredulous Briton—but £1,183,000 of a balance, according to the same return, remained to our credit after we had paid every item of the expenditure which was incurred in the luxury of Dublin Castle government.

One fallacy overthrown only begets another, when the rule of Ireland is the subject of discussion in England. It may possibly be admitted that this parliamentary return (moved for by Col. Nolan, M.P.) was right, and that the Irish people have paid the

the cities and towns of Ireland. Ask of the enormous constabulary and police force. Ask of any Irishman, no matter of what party, and the answer will be—conquest. True, our Government merits the good will of one-fifth of the nation, and even receives it so long as the Executive is careful not to offend that section by a rash interference with their hereditary privileges. But we annexed the real body of the Irish nation, and though we have been liberating them by inches ever since, they steadfastly refuse to acquiesce cordially in our presence as rulers. There is only one alternative. We must either rule them by force or let them go free. And while we continue to rule them we must make them contented by punishing discontent. As some minister so beautifully puts it, we must endeavour to reconcile them to our Government, while putting down crime with a firm hand. It is a noble task, and one in which we have glorious encouragements to persevere, from the example of the Czar in Russia, the Austrians in Italy, and other enlightened governments elsewhere."—*The Truth about Ireland*, by an English Liberal. London: Kegan Paul & Co., 1884, p. 15.

expenses incurred by English officials in ruling them; but then look at Scotland! See how much more *she* contributes, and mark how much less is *her* bill for Government housekeeping than Ireland. True. But before a just comparison can be instituted between the two countries in these respects, we must take into account their respective tax-paying capacity. We must consider the wealth of Ireland and Scotland.

In 1882, the property upon which legacy and succession duty was paid in Ireland amounted to £7,142,912. In Scotland, it was £16,473,542. The annual value of the property assessed to income tax was as follows in the two countries:—

SCOTLAND.				IRELAND.			
Houses	...	£11,838,269	...	£3,210,504			
Railways	...	3,055,464	...	1,128,224			
Land	...	7,711,895	...	9,980,650			
Mines	...	803,122	...	17,205			
Ironworks	...	484,874	...	100			
		£23,893,624	...	£14,336,683			

It will be seen, from this comparison, that the taxable wealth of Ireland is but 7-12ths of that of Scotland, and if Scotland's just share of Imperial revenue amounts to £9,137,000 (the figures given in Col. Nolan's return) Ireland's relative contribution should be only £5,330,000, instead of £8,194,000, or £2,864,000 less than is now exacted from the Irish people.

It is also true that the rule of Scotland cost but £2,665,000, while that of Ireland amounted to £7,000,000 in the above year. But this only shows that a country which is virtually ruled by its own people can be governed for one-third the expense which the government of another country, not much larger, entails, when it is carried on by alien and obnoxious officials.

In this connexion the following figures ought to convey an instructive lesson on the cost of Castle rule to Ireland. Compare, from the official returns, the two countries in regard to—

(SCOTLAND.)				(IRELAND.)			
Law and Justice	...	£605,011	...	£1,028,285			
Constabulary	...	—	...	1,530,144			
Military Forces	...	558,439	...	1,854,466			
Naval Forces	...	105,629	...	223,036			
Pensions	...	300,016	...	555,148			
Viceregal Household	...	—	...	30,501			
		£1,569,095	...	£5,221,580			

A study of these figures will not induce Scotchmen to agitate for a North British system of Castle rule. Perhaps Englishmen may also conclude from the arguments which these statistics enforce, that the Irish people have good and substantial reason for their detestation of a kind of government which robs the taxpayer while it insults the nation.]

LECTURE XXXIV.

POLITICAL JUSTICE: HOW THE ANGLO-IRISH PROBLEM COULD
BE SOLVED.

“What will satisfy the Irish People?”—Stock Opinions and Arguments of Englishmen—Ireland learning “to make the Ruling Power uneasy”—Difficulties in the way of a Formulation of Ireland’s Demand for Political Justice—Degrees of Intensity of Irish National Sentiment—Physical *v.* Moral Force Ideas—Serious Considerations for Irish Leaders—Outline of a Scheme of County and National Government for Ireland—Duties of Elective County Boards—Functions of a National Assembly—Conclusion—Liberation of the “Chairman”—A Lesson in Liberty.

THE question is frequently asked, “What will satisfy the Irish people?” And the answer is as frequently volunteered, “Nothing. Nothing will satisfy them but total separation—and that they won’t get.” It is an illogical way of answering a question, but pardonable in an Englishman; and the impatience which it manifests is also strikingly characteristic. Your ordinary Englishman entertains the pretty conceit that English rule is of such a beneficent character that any people who do not tamely submit to it are to be pitied and—dragooned. While in particular, the Irish people, for their obstinacy in refusing to see any virtue in English rule in Ireland, “must be clearly made to understand,” and “must be told once for all,” that England will maintain her hold upon Ireland at all costs. All this talk is indulged in really for the sake of concealing the chagrin which England experiences in consequence of the fact, revealed in recent years, that the people of Ireland have discovered how to make it more difficult for England to rule

Ireland, than to govern all the rest of her vast empire put together. English Statesmen, even now, are devising a middle course between things as they are, and total separation. They are casting about for a scheme which will combine the characteristics of modern statesmanship—a scheme, for example, which will involve as small a concession as possible to the demand of the people concerned, and have a fair chance of passing the House of Lords. Eminent statesmen have more than once challenged Irish public men to say what they want, but the required answer has not been forthcoming. There have been answers, but they have been too reasonable. English statesmen have not been able to offer upon them the comment, “We told you so, the thing demanded is utterly out of the range of practical politics, and, in point of fact, is absolutely out of the question.” The answer really required is such a one as English statesmen can meet with a *non possumus*. And for this reason, English statesmen, I repeat, know that a substantial concession will have to be made to the genius of Irish nationality within the next few years. The demand for it is too strong to be resisted; for the Irish race have to be dealt with now. If at home on Irish soil the people can “make the ruling powers uneasy” to such an extent as I have indicated, in Westminster their representatives can clog the wheels of legislation and endanger the very existence of government by parliamentary methods; while abroad, in Great Britain, America, Australia, Canada, the exiled Irish have discovered how to operate on the flank, so to speak, by elevating the Irish question into the position of a national or colonial issue. Further, England’s guilt towards Ireland is known and commented on all over the world. Further still, the real people of England—the working men of England—have of late been asking for the reasons why Ireland should be perpetually discontented, and the answers they have received, to the credit of their common sense, be it said, do not appear to have satisfied them. Respectable

England is very angry ; and, to conceal their annoyance at the inevitable, and to pave the way for a concession, English statesmen ask the question of Irish public men—"What do you want?" and require an answer to which they may return an emphatic "impossible." But this is only diplomacy. They only desire us to say how much we want, in order to say in reply how little they will give. They ask us to "formulate our demand," that they, in formulating their concession, may assure their opponents of its comparative innocence. Responsible Irish public men have declined to fall into the trap. And they have acted very wisely. For why should Irish public men show their hand rather than English Prime Ministers?

Apart altogether from considerations of this character, however, there are others of a distinctly Irish nature which the leaders of the National movement in Ireland have to take into account. The varying shades of National sentiment may not be ignored. Let us therefore analyse the degrees of intensity of Irish Nationalist aspirations.

We have first, the Extremists, those who believe that total separation from England is the only thing that would satisfy Irish genius or develop it properly. These include the most self-sacrificing Irishmen. They represent, in their aspirations for Irish liberty, those who have made the most illustrious names in Ireland's history. They include many cultured men, especially among the expatriated portion of the race, but their main strength is in the working classes. Patriotism is purer among the industrial order because less modified by mercenary motives and less liable to corrupting influences. But the Extremists or Separatists are divided among themselves upon the question of method. There are Separatists who advocate physical force, believing moral force, that is, constitutional means, ineffectual and demoralising. This section includes men who have never tried moral force and who believe solely either in "honourable warfare" or "dynamite." It also includes those who have tried moral force, and given it up in despair. Then there are the

Separatists, who, with the experiences of '48 and '67 before their minds, rely upon constitutional action alone.

Next in importance to the Extremists come the Home Rulers, or Federalists, who may be divided into those who disbelieve in the possibility of Separation and those who do not see its necessity. This section of the National party includes some of the ablest and most earnest men in Ireland. Their methods, I need hardly say, are strictly constitutional.

No Irish leader can afford to ignore either of these two principal phases of Irish National sentiment. Were such a man to commit himself to a definite scheme, at the mere invitation of an English Minister, he would run the risk of alienating that section of his supporters whose views were not represented in his proposals. It is an obvious remark that such a contingency would not be unwelcome to English statesmen. From what I have just said, it will be readily perceived how difficult is the task to which Irish popular leaders are asked to address themselves.

Nevertheless, I shall venture to outline a scheme of local and National self-government which, I believe, would command the support of the majority of the Irish people at home and abroad, and which would probably receive a fair trial at the hands of the Extremists; though its operation would undoubtedly be watched with a jealous eye.

In the first place, there should be established in Ireland a system of county government, by means of Elective Boards, to take the place of the existing unrepresentative and practically irresponsible Grand Jury system. The functions of such Boards should be more comprehensive than those exercised by the Grand Juries. For example, in addition to the duty of administering purely county business, these Boards should be permitted to initiate measures of general application; such as schemes of arterial drainage, tramways, railways, canals, docks, harbours, and similar enterprises, which would be of more than local importance and character. Such schemes, after being fully discussed by these elective bodies, would be submitted to the

National Assembly to be subsequently described. Then the County Boards should control the police within the county, and appoint the magistrates, and be entirely responsible for the preservation of law and order.

Further, should the land problem be justly and satisfactorily solved on the lines of national proprietary, the duty of assessing and collecting the land-tax would naturally devolve upon the County Boards, which, deducting what was necessary for the expenses of county government, would remit the balance to the National Exchequer. In fact, the object of such a system should be to constitute each county, as far as practicable, a self-governing community.

Manifestly any system of local self-government for Ireland involves a corresponding one of National self-government as its natural and inevitable complement. To extend the principle of local self-government at all in Ireland, without radically changing the system of Castle rule, would only have the effect of increasing the friction already existing between the people and their rulers. Hence, it is absolutely necessary that legislation for National self-government should go hand in hand with any scheme for the creation of Elective County Boards. I am well aware that the hope is indulged, in some quarters, that the inclusion of Ireland in a general measure of county government, with the sop of an Irish Parliamentary Grand Committee thrown in, will suffice to choke off the demand for Irish legislative independence; but English statesmen need not delude themselves with the idea that any such Westminster expedient will satisfy the genius of Irish Nationality.

There could be established in Dublin a National Assembly, composed of elected members from the constituencies of Ireland, who should proceed to the administration of all Irish affairs in the manner which obtains in colonial parliaments, excepting the substitution of one for two Chambers, here proposed. That is to say, the Representative of the Crown in Ireland would call upon some member of the National Assembly to form a govern-

ment, the different members of which should be constituted the heads of the various Boards, which at present are practically irresponsible bureaucracies; but which, under the system here proposed, would become departments of a popular government, and open to the supervision of the people through the National Assembly. Such a government, subject to the control of the governed through their elected representatives, would be the practical solution of the Anglo-Irish difficulty. It would be but the common definition of constitutional rule carried into practice. It would, as already remarked, be the application to misgoverned and unfortunate Ireland of a constitution kindred to that which British statesmanship has long since granted, wisely and well, to a consequently peaceful and contented Canada.

Certainly if a similar act of political justice and sound policy does not solve the Irish difficulty, nothing less will. What possible danger could England run from such an application of constitutional rule to a country much nearer to the centre of Imperial power than Canada? But what a beneficent change for Ireland—nay, what a relief to England herself—would be involved in such an act of simple political justice!

Now, Mr. Chairman, our task is done, and your right to liberty can no longer be resisted by me. I shall feel our separation keenly; for our companionship has been to me a source of singular happiness. You have robbed solitary confinement of its inhuman features, while the little care and attention which your simple wants required at my hands, have kept in play those better attributes of poor humanity that manifest themselves in the solicitude which one being exhibits for the welfare of another, but for the exercise of which there is neither scope nor opportunity in penal servitude. But with to-morrow's advent I will surely open your cage, and you shall be as free as the air upon which your wings are longing to unfold themselves.

CONCLUSION.

It was a lovely morning in the autumn of 1881, and the infirmary garden in Portland Prison was aglow with the bloom of the late summer flowers which the Governor had kindly permitted me to sow in the early portion of the year. The English Channel, which often lulls the weary Portland prisoner to sleep by the storm-chorus of its waves as they dash against the rocks underneath the walls, lay in unruffled calm. From the headland upon which the great convict establishment stands could be seen the picturesque shadows which the Dorsetshire cliffs flung out upon the bosom of the sea. Away beyond the coast-line appeared harvest-fields and homesteads, melting into the distance, and so sadly suggestive of what imprisonment was not—liberty, home, and friends—conjuring up that contrast between the manacled and the free which constitutes the keenest mental pain in the punishment of penal servitude.

It was a day which would fill one's whole being with a yearning to be liberated—a day of sunshine and warmth and beauty, and the moment had arrived when my resolution to give freedom to my little feathered "chum" could no longer be selfishly postponed. I opened his door with a trembling hand, when quick as a flash of lightning he rushed from the cage with a wild scream of delight, and in a moment was beyond the walls of the prison! The instinct of freedom was too powerful to be resisted, though I had indulged the fond hope that he would have remained with me. But he taught me the lesson, which can never be unlearned by either country, prisoner or bird, that Nature will not be denied, and that Liberty is more to be desired than fetters of gold.

THE END.

